OXFORD STUDIES IN HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

Unity and Catholicity in Christ

The Ecclesiology of Francisco Suárez, S.J.

ERIC J. DEMEUSE

Unity and Catholicity in Christ

OXFORD STUDIES IN HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

Series Editor
Richard A. Muller, Calvin Theological Seminary

Founding Editor
David C. Steinmetz †

Editorial Board
Robert C. Gregg, Stanford University
George M. Marsden, University of Notre Dame
Wayne A. Meeks, Yale University
Gerhard Sauter, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn
Susan E. Schreiner, University of Chicago
John Van Engen, University of Notre Dame
Robert L. Wilken, University of Virginia

AUGUSTINE'S EARLY THEOLOGY OF IMAGE
A Study in the Development of Pro-Nicene Theology
Gerald Boersma

PATRON SAINT AND PROPHET
Jan Hus in the Bohemian and German Reformations
Phillip N. Haberkern

JOHN OWEN AND ENGLISH PURITANISM
Experiences of Defeat
Crawford Gribben

MORALITY AFTER CALVIN
Theodore Beza's Christian Censor and Reformed Ethics
Kirk M. Summers

THE PAPACY AND THE ORTHODOX
A History of Reception and Rejection
Edward Siecienski

DEBATING PERSEVERANCE
The Augustinian Heritage in Post-Reformation England
Jay T. Collier

THE REFORMATION OF PROPHECY
Early Modern Interpretations of the Prophet & Old Testament Prophecy
G. Sujin Pak

ANTOINE DE CHANDIEU
The Silver Horn of Geneva's Reformed Triumvirate
Theodore G. Van Raalte

ORTHODOX RADICALS
Baptist Identity in the English Revolution
Matthew C. Bingham

DIVINE PERFECTION AND HUMAN POTENTIALITY
The Trinitarian Anthropology of Hilary of Poitiers
Jarred A. Mercer

THE GERMAN AWAKENING
Protestant Renewal after the Enlightenment, 1815–1848
Andrew Kloes

THE REGENSBURG ARTICLE 5 ON JUSTIFICATION
Inconsistent Patchwork or Substance of True Doctrine?
Anthony N. S. Lane

AUGUSTINE ON THE WILL
A Theological Account
Han-luen Kantzer Komline

THE SYNOD OF PISTORIA AND VATICAN II
Jansenism and the Struggle for Catholic Reform
Shaun Blanchard

CATHOLICITY AND THE COVENANT OF WORKS
James Ussher and the Reformed Tradition
Harrison Perkins

THE COVENANT OF WORKS
The Origins, Development, and Reception of the Doctrine
J. V. Fesko

RINGLEADERS OF REDEMPTION
How Medieval Dance Became Sacred
Kathryn Dickason

REFUSING TO KISS THE SLIPPER
Opposition to Calvinism in the Francophone Reformation
Michael W. Bruening

FONT OF PARDON AND NEW LIFE
John Calvin and the Efficacy of Baptism
Lyle D. Bierma

THE FLESH OF THE WORD
The extra Calvinisticum *from Zwingli to Early Orthodoxy*
K. J. Drake

JOHN DAVENANT'S HYPOTHETICAL UNIVERSALISM
A Defense of Catholic and Reformed Orthodoxy
Michael J. Lynch

RHETORICAL ECONOMY IN AUGUSTINE'S THEOLOGY
Brian Gronewoller

GRACE AND CONFORMITY
The Reformed Conformist Tradition and the Early Stuart Church of England
Stephen Hampton

MAKING ITALY ANGLICAN
Why the Book of Common Prayer Was Translated into Italian
Stefano Villani

AUGUSTINE ON MEMORY
Kevin G. Grove

UNITY AND CATHOLICITY IN CHRIST
The Ecclesiology of Francisco Suarez, S.J.
Eric J. DeMeuse

Unity and Catholicity in Christ

The Ecclesiology of Francisco Suárez, S.J.

ERIC J. DEMEUSE

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford. It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship, and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press in the UK and certain other countries.

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America.

© Oxford University Press 2022

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted by law, by license, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reproduction rights organization. Inquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the address above.

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2021057630
ISBN 978–0–19–763863–7

DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780197638637.001.0001

1 3 5 7 9 8 6 4 2

Printed by Integrated Books International, United States of America

To Danielle

He has been all things to us. . . . What is it to us how our future path lies, if it be but His path? What is it to us whither it leads us, so that in the end it leads to Him?

—St. John Henry Newman, "Remembrance of Past Mercies,"
Parochial and Plain Sermons

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments ix
List of Abbreviations xi

Introduction: Reappraising Early Modern Ecclesiology 1

1. The Church as a Way of Life 23
2. The Christic Unity of the Church 59
3. The Missional Catholicity of the Church 117
4. The Society of Jesus as the Ideal Expression of Unity and Catholicity 149

Conclusion: Suárez's Ecclesiological Legacy 179

Bibliography 189
Index 199

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book is the fruit of three loves. The first is my love for the historical period of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This love was fostered by my teacher and friend, Matthew Gaetano, in undergraduate studies at Hillsdale College. It was during those formative years that I first realized, much to my surprise, that Luther and Calvin were not quite what I thought them to be—or what I as a life-long Catholic was supposed to think them to be. This led to a great interest in the Reformations, both Catholic and Protestant, and a desire to discover what *really* happened and what was *really* taught during those tumultuous centuries. This love of rediscovery fueled by a contrarian disposition led me, ultimately, to try to rehabilitate another great thinker of this era, Francisco Suárez.

Second, growing up in Catholic schools, I knew only a handful of Protestants before the age of eighteen. During my freshman year at college, all of my closest friends were Protestants of various stripes, and they were very devout. The ecumenical-dialogues-in-miniature we held in our dormitories led us to realize that it was primarily in the area of ecclesiology that our respective traditions diverged. My desire to study Catholic ecclesiology arose from such conversations and from a desire "that all may be one" (Jn. 17:21).

The third love is for the spirituality of the Jesuit tradition and St. Ignatius. I first experienced Ignatius' teaching in the practice of spiritual direction with Fr. Mathias Thelen and Fr. Carlos Rodriguez before I actually encountered it in his writings. His *Spiritual Exercises* helped me to accept my vocation in freedom and joy and continue to be a spiritual companion.

A project like this one is only possible because of many great teachers and friends. To try to disentangle the influence of each would be, to borrow an image from Jacques Maritain, as difficult as "to tell at a river's mouth which waters come from which glaciers and which tributaries." Nevertheless a few must be mentioned.

My first and greatest debt of gratitude belongs to the LORD, the "one teacher" (Mt. 23:10) at the source of all my thoughts and desires. To Him I owe everything.

As a teacher, I continue to be amazed at the importance of parents and family for the formation of a mind and heart. The blessing that my parents have been to me is inestimable. My father taught me how to work hard and never to quit. My mother taught me, through her long-suffering love, that only in Christ is our true peace. My sisters have been models of Christian virtue. My brother-in-law, David, and the Kinderman family have been constant supports.

At Villanova University I was blessed with many brilliant teachers, but none so formative as Kevin Hughes. Through his classes, but mainly by his example, he taught me how to be a theologian at the heart of the Church.

This book, which began as a doctoral dissertation, is the fruit of the care and dedication of Marquette University's theology department. I thank in a special way Susan Wood, who has been a ceaseless encouragement; Fr. Joseph Mueller, S.J., who has taught me how to write and think with clarity; Mickey Mattox, who has been a frequent conversation partner and guide; and Ulrich Lehner, whose careful and reassuring direction of this project is but a microcosm of the care and energy that he devotes to the intellectual life.

There have been other teachers and guides along the way, in particular Fr. Gordon Gilsdorf, of happy memory, and Robert Fastiggi. I am also grateful for the recommendations of Richard Muller, the anonymous peer-reviewers of this manuscript, and the editorial staff at Oxford University Press.

I have been blessed with many friends who have not only formed my way of thinking but also have been for me, as St. Basil was for St. Gregory Nazianzen, "a standard and rule for discerning right from wrong." I thank in particular Fr. Kyle Sladek, Travis Lacy, Austin Detwiler, Fr. John LoCoco, Patrick Timmis, Carl Vennerstrom, Israel McGrew, Gannon Hyland, Shaun Blanchard, Fr. Aaron Pidel, S.J., and Fr. Chris Krall, S.J. I also thank the faculty, staff, and families of Chesterton Academy of Milwaukee for their constant support, and I thank the school board for insisting on finding time for me to work on my dissertation amid all the duties of running a school.

My children have been a great joy (and motivation) throughout this process. They daily reveal to me God's jealous and unconditional love. For them I am immensely grateful.

Finally, my utmost gratitude goes to my beloved wife, Danielle. Her patience, joy, peace, and strength are my delight, yet even these praises seem like mere babble in light of what she truly means to me. That, I can hardly express. *Da mihi amantem, et sentiet quod dico.* To her I dedicate this work.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Acta	*Acta Synodalia Concilii Vaticani Secundi*. 25 vols. Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanus, 1970–1996.
Cons	*Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu, Monumenta Ignatiana*, Series Tertia. *Sancti Ignatii de Loyola Constitutiones Societatis Jesu.* 4 vols. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1934.
DH	*Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations on Matters of Faith and Morals.* 43rd edition, originally compiled by Heinrich Denzinger; revised, enlarged, and, in collaboration with Helmut Hoping, edited by Peter Hünermann for the original bilingual edition; and edited by Robert Fastiggi and Anne Englund Nash for the English edition. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012.
EppIgn	*Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu*, Series Prima. *Epistulae Sancti Ignatii.*12 vols. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1903–1911.
FN	*Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu.* Series Quarta. *Fontes narrativi de S. Ignatio de Loyola de Societatis Iesu initiis.* Edited by D. Fernández Zapico, C. de Dalmases, and P. Leturia. 4 vols. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1943–1960.
Letters	*Letters of St. Ignatius of Loyola*. Translated by William J. Young, S.J. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1959.
Letters and Instructions	*Ignatius of Loyola: Letters and Instructions.* Edited by Martin E. Palmer, S.J., John W. Padberg, S.J., and John L. McCarthy, S.J. St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Resources, 2006.

Op	Francisco Suárez, S.J. *Opera Omnia.* Edited by M. André and C. Berton. 28 vols. Paris: Ludovicus Vivès, 1856–1878.
Ratio Studiorum	*Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu*. Vol. 129. *Monumenta Paedagogica Societatis Iesu.* Vol. 5. *Ratio atque institutio studiorum S.I. 1599.* Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1986.
SpEx	*Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu.* Vol. 100. *Monumenta Ignatiana,* Series Secunda. *Exercitia spiritualia S. Ignatii de Loyola et eorum Directoria.* Vol. 1. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1969.

Introduction

Reappraising Early Modern Ecclesiology

I.1. Historical Narratives of Early Modern Ecclesiology

The Reformations of the sixteenth century prompted theologians on all sides to re-examine the foundations of ecclesial unity and catholicity. What does it mean that the Church is "one," given the divisions that both preceded and resulted from Luther's attempted reforms, and who now constitutes this unity?[1] How can the Church, wounded by the fracturing of both Christendom and Christianity, claim to be "catholic" and "universal"? These questions, along with so many others, continued to dominate the ecclesiological conversation in the ensuing centuries.[2] In the years leading up to the Second Vatican Council, ecclesial unity and catholicity received even greater attention, ultimately becoming central aspects of the ecclesiological reforms promoted at the Council.[3]

[1] The schisms that occurred throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were by no means clean breaks; that is, in the various affected regions, it was not always clear who was what we would now delineate "Roman Catholic" and who was "Protestant." See, for example, Franz Posset, *Unser Martin: Martin Luther aus der Sicht katholischer Sympathisanten* (Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 2015); Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010).

[2] See, for example, Gustave Thils, *Les notes de l'Église dans l'apologétique catholique depuis la réforme* (Paris: Desclee de Brouwer, 1937); Ulrich L. Lehner, *The Catholic Enlightenment: The Forgotten History of a Global Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

[3] The centrality of unity and catholicity in the Council's reforms can be seen both in the documents themselves as well as in the statement of the 1985 Synod of Bishops, who famously declared the ecclesiology of communion to be "the central and fundamental idea of the council's documents" in large part because communion is the foundation for understanding the "correct relationship between unity and pluriformity in the Church," immediately adding that pluriformity, when it "is true richness and carries with it fullness, this is true catholicity." *Extraordinary Synod of*

Unity and Catholicity in Christ. Eric J. DeMeuse, Oxford University Press. © Oxford University Press 2022.
DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780197638637.003.0001

Of course, every reform carries with it an historical narrative justifying the need for renewal, that is, something became "de-formed" and thus needs to be "re-formed."[4] In the narratives championed by advocates of the ecclesiological renewal of the last hundred years, the deformation is often said to have occurred in the very period when unity and catholicity received heightened attention: what is commonly called "early modern Catholicism."[5] Avery Cardinal Dulles remarks that "Counter Reformation" theologians understood ecclesial unity primarily in institutional and juridical terms and thus "attended less than they should to God, to Christ, and to the Holy Spirit."[6] As a consequence, post-Tridentine theologians overemphasized ecclesial "uniformity," ignoring in large part the "legitimate variety" inherently affirmed by the Church's catholicity.[7] Catholicity was instead reduced to its quantitative, geographical character, and correlatively missionary work was considered "statistically measurable."[8] Dulles's assessment is not unique but rather the standard narrative of ecclesiological surveys today.[9]

Bishops, Rome, 1985: A Message to the People of God and the Final Report (Washington, DC: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1986), C1–2, 17–18.

[4] I adopt this term "reform" in support of recent efforts that favor reading the Council via a "hermeneutic of reform," recognizing continuity and discontinuity on different levels. Though there are disagreements on how to understand this hermeneutic, it is accepted as a starting point by Pope Benedict XVI in his Christmas 2005 address to the Roman Curia, available on the Vatican website, http://w2.vatican.va, and also by John W. O'Malley, "'The Hermeneutic of Reform': A Historical Analysis," *Theological Studies* 73 (2012): 517–46. See also Shaun Blanchard, *The Synod of Pistoia and Vatican II: Jansenism and the Struggle for Catholic Reform* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 22–51. I would add that it is important to remember that something "deformed" is not lacking all form. No serious Catholic ecclesiologist denies the necessary contributions made by those of a different epoch. The argument centers more on the fact that some things are overemphasized and others are underemphasized or altogether omitted. A "reform" in the truest sense of the word attempts to re-establish a proportion that has been lost, and does not try to build something altogether new or completely reject that which has gone before.

[5] On the adequacy of this term to describe the period in question, see John W. O'Malley, "Was Ignatius Loyola a Church Reformer?: How to Look at Early Modern Catholicism," *Catholic Historical Review* 77 (1991): 177–93. For a summary of the terminological debate, see Robert Bireley, *The Refashioning of Catholicism, 1450–1700* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1999), 1–8.

[6] Avery Cardinal Dulles, S.J., *Models of the Church* (New York: Image, 2014), 36. Though Dulles later remarks that he "may have been somewhat too severe in [treating] the institutional model," he nevertheless still deems a lopsided emphasis on the institutional model to be predominant in "late Scholasticism" (196).

[7] Avery Cardinal Dulles, S.J., *The Catholicity of the Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 82.

[8] Dulles, *Models of the Church*, 34.

[9] See, for example, Benoît-Dominique de la Soujeole, *Introduction to the Mystery of the Church*, trans. Michael J. Miller (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2014), 185, 362ff.; Richard R. Gaillardetz, *The Church in the Making: Lumen Gentium, Christus Dominus, Orientalium Ecclesiarum* (New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2006), 61–62; Marie Joseph de Guillon, "History of Ecclesiology," in *Sacramentum Mundi*, vol. 1, ed. Karl Rahner et al. (New York/London: Herder

For many theologians, then, the ecclesiology[10] of early modern Catholicism continues to serve as the foil against which they frame the reforms of Vatican II.

There are grains of truth in these narratives, of course. The ecclesiology after Trent did emphasize the structural features of the Church and the importance of communion with the bishops and the pope as a natural response to the ecclesial problems following the council. Yet was early modern ecclesiology as "one-sided" as its critics maintain,[11] portraying a caricature rather than an icon of the Body of Christ? This is the accusation leveled against it, but it is an accusation frequently based on a twofold methodological shortcoming. First, most accounts study and assess only the treatises *de Ecclesia* that burgeoned during the late sixteenth century. Yet these treatises were not comprehensive ecclesiologies comparable to those composed in the twentieth century, but were treatises limited in scope and intended for the classroom, for polemics, or for answering pointed questions about an aspect of the Church. This fact is clearly seen in the authors' own descriptions of their works, and is even recognized by some current scholars critical of the ecclesiology of the period.[12] Thus, in order to judge Tridentine ecclesiology justly, scholars need to examine a wider array of sources and genres. Such an expansion either would make such criticisms more robust and convincing, or it would reveal their shortcomings.

Second, while some nuanced accounts of Catholic ecclesiology after Trent admit a diversity of viewpoints on the Church, sometimes even admitting the existence of *ecclesiologies* or schools of ecclesiology,[13] others highlight just a

and Herder/Burns & Oates, 1968), 316. Other accounts take their cue directly from Dulles: Eric Plumer, "The Development of Ecclesiology: Early Church to the Reformation," in *The Gift of the Church: A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.*, ed. Peter C. Phan (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 42–43; Thomas P. Rausch, S.J., *Towards a Truly Catholic Church: An Ecclesiology for the Third Millennium* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003), 64. Rausch calls the ecclesiology of the early modern period "rigid, authoritarian, clerical, and not open to ecumenism; furthermore, it left little room for the charismata." Even Giuseppe Alberigo and Emily Michelson lament the "uniformity" and "static ecclesiology" of what they call "Tridentinism." "From the Council of Trent to 'Tridentinism,'" in *From Trent to Vatican II: Historical and Theological Investigations,* ed. Raymond F. Bulman et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 28.

[10] I recognize the anachronistic use of this term "ecclesiology" and employ it only as a useful shorthand to describe the discourse on, and study of, the Church during the period in question. As will become clear, most treatises *de Ecclesia* were not purporting to be comprehensive and systematic *ecclesiologies.*

[11] This is the language used by Aloys Grillmeier, "The Mystery of the Church," *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II,* vol. 1, trans. Lalit Adolphus, Kevin Smyth, and Richard Strachan (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966), 138.

[12] Soujeole, *Introduction,* 369. Unfortunately, this recognition by Soujeole is not reflected in his analysis of early modern texts, which he limits to treatises *de Ecclesia.*

[13] See, for example, Thils, *Les notes de l'Église*; Emile Mersch, S.J., *The Whole Christ: The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Mystical Body in Scripture and Tradition,* trans. John R. Kelly, S.J. (London: Dennis Dobson, 1938); Yves Congar, O.P., *L'Église de Saint Augustin à l'époque moderne*

few figures and exaggerate their importance in early modern ecclesiology. In particular, many accounts explicitly ground their criticisms almost entirely in St. Robert Bellarmine's second chapter of the *De Ecclesia militante* and his famous definition of the Church as a "community of persons bound together by the profession of the same Christian faith and by communion of the same sacraments, under the direction of legitimate pastors, and especially under the Roman Pontiff, the one vicar of Christ on earth."[14] This definition of the Church, coupled with Bellarmine's insistence that "no internal virtue" is required to be a member of this ecclesial community, which is just as "visible and palpable as the community of the Roman people, or the Kingdom of France, or the Republic of Venice," is taken as the standard view of early modern theologians.[15] Without denying the impact of this "definition" both in its own day and even up to the eve of Vatican II,[16] such an extensive focus on one writer and only one of his

(Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970); Francis Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church 1300–1870* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). These accounts do not overlook the pervasiveness of certain trends, of course, but they do avoid the reductionism present in many current ecclesiological surveys of the period that exaggerate the importance of certain figures and themes. Giuseppe Alberigo, though arguing that the Council of Trent itself proffered no single ecclesiology, nevertheless laments that the generation after Trent narrowed the ecclesiological playing field in favor of uniformity. See "Die Ekklesiologie des Konzils von Trient," in *Concilium Tridentinum*, ed. Remigius Bäumer (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1979), 281; and Giuseppe Alberigo and Emily Michelson, "From the Council of Trent to 'Tridentinism'," in *From Trent to Vatican II: Historical and Theological Investigations*, ed. Raymond F. Bulman, Frederick J. Parrella, and Jill Raitt (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 19–37.

[14] Robert Bellarmine, S.J., *De controversiis Christianae fidei adversus huius temporis hæreticos* (Venice: Joannem Malachinum, 1721), vol. 2, controversy 2, bk. 3, ch. 2, 53D: *. . . coetum hominum ejusdem Christianae fidei professione, & eorundem Sacramentorum communione colligatum, sub regimine legitimorum pastorum, ac praecipue unius Christi in terris Vicarii Romani Pontificis*. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

[15] Ibid., 54A: *Ecclesia enim est coetus hominum ita visibilis, & palpabilis, ut est coetus populi Romani, vel Regnum Galliae, aut Respublica Venetorum*. For those who base their judgments primarily on this passage, see Soujeole, *Introduction to the Mystery of the Church*, 185, 362ff.; Dulles, *Models of the Church*, 8–9, 33, 36, 121; Plumer, "The Development of Ecclesiology: Early Church to the Reformation," 42–43; Guillon, "History of Ecclesiology," 316. Soujeole has recently clarified his critique of Bellarmine in Soujeole, "A Response from Benoît-Dominique de la Soujeole on Bellarmine and His Posterity," trans. Eric J. DeMeuse, *The Regensburg Forum*, September 23, 2016, http://www.regensburgforum.com.

[16] Bellarmine's influence in later Catholic ecclesiology is traced in Soujeole, *Introduction*, 370–72. This influence is further evident, with slight but important nuance (such as the addition of the adverb *plene* to the discussion of incorporation or communion), in both *Lumen Gentium* 14 and in the 1983 *Codex Iuris Canonici* (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1983), canon 205. Protestant writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries devoted much of their apologetic energies to responding to Bellarmine's *De controversiis*, particularly in the realm of ecclesiology. Lutheran scholastic Johann Gerhard frames his entire commonplace *De Ecclesia* as a response to Bellarmine's *De Ecclesia militante* and *De notis Ecclesiae.* Quenstedt also makes Bellarmine his chief interlocutor. Among Anglicans,

works[17] has eclipsed the diverse ecclesiological conversation that arose after Trent and the impact of this conversation on the future of Catholic ecclesiology.[18] Such an oversimplification distorts not only historical accounts of early modern Catholicism, but also systematic accounts of continuity, discontinuity, reform, and development. If such theories are to be steeped in history,[19] then it is necessary to reconstruct historical narratives accurately and responsibly. Further, this reconstruction will not only inform our derivative theories, but also locate, illumine, and correct our biases. As Henri de Lubac writes, when things are set in facile opposition to each other, "reality is thus dissociated." And when "one of the terms is caricatured to solve a difficulty, then one necessarily misunderstands what one wishes to retain and exalt."[20]

It is for these reasons that this book examines the ecclesiology of the Spanish Jesuit Francisco Suárez, and particularly his understanding of unity and what

Anthony Milton remarks that Bellarmine's *De controversiis* "continued to represent the most important single defence of Roman Catholic doctrine throughout the early Stuart period, and all subsequent controversies were indebted to Bellarmine's works for laying out the structure of their argument. It was a frequent jibe of later Protestant polemicists that their Romanist opponents were merely copying Bellarmine's arguments. . . . Throughout Europe, attacks on Bellarmine were regarded by Protestants as a way of demonstrating their confessional orthodoxy, or as a means of reasserting Protestant unity against the threat of inter-Protestant tensions." In *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 15.

[17] We should not presume, in light of the first methodological concern, that this chapter of the *De Ecclesia militante* is Bellarmine's last word on the Church. Michael J. Himes astutely notes that "Bellarmine was far too acute a theologian not to know that his definition was a limited one." "The Development of Ecclesiology: Modernity to the Twentieth Century," in *The Gift of the Church: A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.*, ed. Peter C. Phan (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 48. Joseph Clifford Fenton, in a 1944 article on "The Use of the Terms Body and Soul with Reference to the Catholic Church," *Ecclesiastical Review* 110 (January 1944): 48–57, notes the dangers of reducing Bellarmine's ecclesiology to this one chapter of the *De Ecclesia militante.*

[18] Thils makes a very similar point in objecting to authors who have exaggerated the importance of Bellarmine in their ecclesiological surveys. See *Les notes de l'Église*, xi.

[19] Indeed, the very theory of development proposed by John Henry Newman deals with Christianity explicitly "as a fact in the world's history." In the preface of the 1878 edition of his famous *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), Newman succinctly summarizes the idea to which he is responding: "However beautiful and promising that Religion is in theory, its history, we are told, is its best refutation; the inconsistencies, found age after age in its teaching, being as patent as the simultaneous contrarieties of religious opinion manifest in the High, Low, and Broad branches of the Church of England."

[20] Henri de Lubac, *The Motherhood of the Church*, trans. Sergia Englund (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1983), 361. The danger that caricaturing poses to the position one wishes to highlight can be seen in Dulles's distortion of the "communion" model resulting from his overall negative appraisal of the "institutional" model. See Susan K. Wood's critique of Dulles along these lines in "The Church as Communion," *The Gift of the Church: A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.*, ed. Peter C. Phan (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 171–72.

I will call his idea of "missional catholicity." It is my contention that Suárez offers an alternative to the simplistic narratives I have mentioned in at least three ways. First, in his doctrine that the essential unity of the Church consists in spiritual union with Jesus Christ, Suárez shows that the Tridentine Church did not neglect Christ in favor of rigid, juridical thinking, but rather focused on Christ as the unitive center of the Church. Second, in his variegated account of the Church's catholicity, Suárez argues for a catholicity that cannot be reduced to mere statistics, but is born from the Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ and is ordered toward the missional diffusion of the Church throughout the world. Third, in his articulation of the prayers, feasts, members, and, most notably, in the charism of the Society of Jesus, Suárez shows his readers what the spiritual dynamic between Christic unity and missional catholicity looks like in the Church. This investigation thus extends beyond Suárez's standard sources *de Ecclesia* into other works that have not yet been mined for their ecclesiological implications, particularly his *De virtute et statu religionis*. In this way I hope both to enflesh the skeletal representations of post-Tridentine theology popular today, and also to contribute to the present ecclesiological conversation by showing how Suárez can shed light on relevant questions and paradigms with which the Church continues to wrestle.

I.2. Suárez's Theological Method: Jesuit, Humanist, Scholastic

In order to orient our discussion of Suárez's ecclesiology, it will first be helpful to provide some brief biographical notes that speak to his fundamental theological concerns and method. Born in Granada in 1548, Suárez entered the Jesuits as an "indifferent" at the age of sixteen, professing his first simple vows in August 1566 and making his solemn profession on 14 December 1571.[21] He remained a faithful member of the Society until his death in 1617. Later in life Suárez would recall his sustained admiration for the Jesuit way of life—the Society that had educated and nourished him for so many years and to which he owed "all that

[21] The standard biography of Suárez is that of Raoul de Scorraille, *François Suarez, de la Compagnie de Jésus, d'après ses lettres, ses autres écrits inédits et un grand nombre de documents nouveaux*, 2 vols. (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1912–1913). Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., provides an English biography largely based on Scorraille's in *Man of Spain: Francisco Suárez* (New York: Macmillan, 1940). A shorter synopsis of Suárez's life and works can be found in Victor M. Salas and Robert L. Fastiggi, eds., *A Companion to Francisco Suárez* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2015), 1–28.

I am and have."[22] The impact of the Jesuit *ratio vivendi* on Suárez can hardly be overstated.[23]

After his ordination to the priesthood in 1572, Suárez took up teaching posts at Valladolid (until 1580), the Collegio Romano in Rome (1580–1585), the University of Alcalá (1585–1593), Salamanca (1593–1597), and finally Coimbra (1597–1615). A letter to the Society's Superior General, Everard Mercurian, from his time at Valladolid reveals much about Suárez's method of theological inquiry. Accused of teaching "exotic [theological] opinions" and of departing from the teaching of St. Thomas in violation of the Jesuit Constitutions, Suárez responded to such charges first with humble obedience that he had done his best but would, in the future, try harder still "to conform more fully in heart and mind" to the opinions set forth by his superiors.[24] Suárez then sent a second letter to Mercurian which R. Scorraille calls an abridged "autobiography of the theologian." In it, Suárez defends his fidelity to St. Thomas "except on one or two things" (*sino es en una o otra cosa*),[25] and he further explains that the real

[22] *De religione* 10.1 (*Op.* 16.1, 554A): *Cum enim ante quadraginta annos, ex quo haec scribo, scribo autem anno 1595, magno divinae gratiae beneficio ad hanc religionem vocatus sim, et toto hoc tempore in ea educatus, nutritus et conversatus, ejus vivendi rationem ac institutum admiratus semper fuerim . . . ipsi Societati, cui totum quod sum, vel habeo, debitum recognosco.*

[23] There is admittedly a dearth of scholarship on Suárez's identity as a Jesuit and the influence of the Society of Jesus on his thought. A few works treat Suárez's discussion of the Jesuit charism: Paul V. Murphy, "'God's Porters': The Jesuit Vocation according to Francisco Suárez," *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu* 70, no. 139 (2001): 2–28; José M. Castillo, S.J., *La afectividad en los Ejercicios según la teología de Francisco Suárez* (Granada: Archivo Teológico Granadino, 1965). Others show ways that Suárez may have been influenced by Ignatius of Loyola and the Jesuit charism: Harald Schöndorf, S.J., "Individuum und Indifferenz: Francisco Suárez, Philosoph im Geist des Ignatius," *Stimmen der Zeit* 209, no. 2 (February 1991): 109–22; Carlos P. Noreña, "Suárez and the Jesuits," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 65, no. 3 (1991): 267–86; Aaron Pidel, S.J., "Francisco Suárez on Religion and Religious Pluralism," in *Francisco Suárez: Jesuits and the Complexities of Modernity*, ed. Robert Aleksander Markys and Juan Antonio Senent de Frutos (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 128–53; Marco Forlivesi, "Francisco Suárez and the *rationes studiorum* of the Society of Jesus," in *Francisco Suárez and His Legacy: The Impact of Suárezian Metaphysics and Epistemology on Modern Philosophy*, ed. Marco Sgarbi (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2010), 77–90.

[24] Suárez to Everard Mercurian, Valladolid, 10 April 1579, in Scorraille, *François Suarez*, I:161. This response is wholly in accord with St. Ignatius' famous letter on obedience, catalogued under the title "To the Members of the Society in Portugal" dated 26 March 1553, in Ignatius of Loyola, *Letters and Instructions*, 412–21. Even Avellanda, one of Suárez's critics at the heart of this controversy, referred to him as "a good religious" who promises to conform himself to what has been commanded of him. Scorraille, *François Suarez*, I:159.

[25] Suárez to Everard Mercurian, Valladolid, 2 July 1579, cited from the image of the autograph provided in Scorraille, *François Suarez*, I:160–161. Scorraille offers a French translation of the entire letter, and Fichter offers his own summary in *Man of Spain,* 115–19. A Spanish transcription of parts of the letter can be found in Francisco María Aguilera González, *El concepto de teología en el Padre Francisco Suárez* (Mexico City: Universidad Iberoamericana, 2000), 8.

issue is not so much his theological opinions but his method. The custom at the time, Suárez laments, was to teach by handing down notebooks or manuals (*cartapacios*) of what had been said before rather than by looking at things "deeply and drawing them out from their fonts—sacred and human authority and reason, each one in its proper degree of authority." Suárez sought to "depart from this path and to see things more at the root . . . with the result that although the truths which are taught are not new, they are made novel by the method [in which they are taught] or because they depart from the way of the notebooks."[26] Instead of merely passing on data uncritically, Suárez desired to return to the very sources of natural and supernatural knowledge in order to penetrate questions more deeply—a method that remained with him throughout his career.[27] This desire was profoundly humanistic, and the fact that Suárez saw no contradiction between it and his scholastic style suggests more harmony between these two methods than scholars typically recognize.[28]

[26] Suárez to Everard Mercurian, Valladolid, 2 July 1579: *una principal es el modo de leer que yo tengo, que es diferente de lo que los más usan por acá, porque hay costumbre de leer por cartapacios, leyendo las cosas más por tradición de unos a otros que por mirallas* [sic] *hondamente y sacallas* [sic] *de sus fuentes, qui son la authoridad sacra y la humana y la razón, cada cosa en su grado. Yo he procurado salir de este camino y mirar las cosas más de raíz . . . que resulta que, aunque las verdades que se lean no sean nuevas, se hagan nuevas por el modo o porque salen de la vereda de los cartapacios.* On the university method of "reading" (*leer*), see Ulrich G. Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, trans. Michael J. Miller (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010), 279–80.

[27] Suárez prefaces his first book of the *Defensio fidei* 1 (*Op.* 24, 5A) by quoting Cyprian that *si ad divinae traditionis caput et originem revertamur, cessat error humanus. . . . Si canalis aquam ducens, qui copiose prius et largiter profluebat, subito deficiat, nonne ad fontem pergitur.* We will return to Suárez's insistence on a diversity of methods in chapter 3 (particularly in his discussion of the variety of religious orders, *De religione* 9.1.1.13 [*Op.* 16.1, 431B]). A note on quotations from the *Defensio fidei*: Peter Simpson has done an inestimable service in translating the entirety of the *Defensio fidei* in his two-volume *Defense of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith against the Errors of Anglicanism*, 2 vols, trans. Peter L. P. Simpson (New York: Lucairos Occasio, 2012–2013), and I owe a great debt to Simpson's work. However, I use my own translations of the *Defensio* throughout this book unless otherwise noted.

[28] Matthew T. Gaetano writes of the faculty at the University of Padua in the sixteenth century, "Their engagement with Renaissance Aristotelianism and humanism was unexpected [by scholars] . . . [yet] it should be obvious that well-trained scholars chosen to teach at one of the most important intellectual centers in Europe would be up-to-date with the intellectual trends of the previous several decades." "Renaissance Thomism at the University of Padua, 1465–1583," PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2013, 346. Robert Aleksander Markys further demonstrates the early modern Jesuits' fruitful engagement with humanism in *Saint Cicero and the Jesuits: The Influence of the Liberal Arts on the Adoption of Moral Probabilism* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008). Emmanuel J. Bauer refers to Suárez as "Scholastik nach dem Humanismus" in the title of his chapter "Francisco Suárez (1548–1617): Scholastik nach dem Humanismus," *Philosophen der Renaissance: Eine Einführung*, ed. Paul Richard Blum (Darmstadt: Primus, 1999), 206. See also R. Gerald Hobbs, "Reading the Old Testament after Trent: Cardinal Robert Bellarmine and His Italian Predecessors on Psalm Four," *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 12 (2010): 207; Eric J. DeMeuse, "*Nostre Philon:* Philo after Trent," *Studia Philonica Annual* 29 (2017): 87–109.

Much later in his career, Suárez would defend not only a return to traditional sources in theological method, but also measured development in Church praxis and doctrine. In the final part of his *De virtute et statu religionis* finished near the end of his life, Suárez defends the fourth vow of the Jesuits, which professes obedience to the pope concerning missions. Some, Suárez writes, condemn this vow as novel and rash. "But if the religion of the Society according to its own proper institute and manner of living is new, what wonder is it that, to some degree, they profess something new." Suárez continues, "Not everything that is new is reprehensible, but only that which is contrary to antiquity and not that which is introduced into custom due to the needs of the time (*pro temporum opportunitate*) for the perfection of those things which are ancient."[29] Suárez recognizes that the practice of the faithful must be appropriated to the times, and still more that this appropriation can be a work of "perfecting" the things of old. This idea extends not only to "custom" but also to the Church's authority over dogmatic proclamations. In the *Defensio fidei catholicae adversus Anglicanae sectae errores* (1613), Suárez argues that the way of the Holy Spirit was always "not to teach the Church all at once everything that pertains to supernatural doctrine, but [to unfold it] at appropriate times (*pro temporum opportunitate*) according to his most hidden providence."[30] From this principle Suárez argues for a theory of development in Catholic doctrine—a precursor to St. John Henry Newman's famous theory, though with significant differences that others have pointed out.[31] It suffices here simply to note that Suárez recognizes the Holy Spirit as an agent of newness in the Church, a newness that always illumines and perfects the things of old. Suárez is thus not opposed to "something new" so long as it accords with and completes what has come before. Indeed for him, novelty in this sense, perhaps better termed a "blossoming," can indicate the presence of the Holy Spirit.[32]

Suárez's reserved openness to a novelty of method, custom, and doctrine is evident in the structure and content of two of his most famous works, the

[29] *De religione* 10.6.5.24 (*Op.* 16.2, 861B–862A): *Si enim religio Societatis secundum suum proprium institutum et vivendi modum nova est, quid mirum quod aliquid novi etiam profitentur? . . . Non ergo omne novum reprehensibile est, sed quod est antiquitati contrarium, non vero quod pro temporum opportunitate in morem introducitur ad perficienda ea, quae antiqua sunt.*

[30] *Defensio* 1.18.4 (*Op.* 24, 92A): *quia mos Spiritus Sancti semper fuit, non simul Ecclesiam docere de omnibus, quae ad doctrinam supernaturalem pertinent, sed pro temporum opportunitate, juxta dispositionem suae occultissimae providentiae.*

[31] See, for example, Owen Chadwick's famous *From Bossuet to Newman* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

[32] There is, according to Suárez, always that bad form of novelty which obscures and strays from the foundations of the truth. It is this kind of novelty which Suárez attributes to the Protestants, calling them *novatores.* See, for example, *Defensio,* dedicatory letter (*Op.* 24, 62A).

Disputationes metaphysicae and the *De legibus*, but it is also very apparent in his theological works. One manifestation of Suárez's impulse to look to the root of things is his refusal to be confined by the opinions of a certain "school" of theology.[33] This refusal arises, in part, from the fact that he was a member of a relatively new religious order that had no binding scholastic authority as did the Franciscans (Scotus) and Dominicans (Aquinas). It is, however, not true that the Franciscans and Dominicans never veered from their respective doctors, or that the Jesuits avoided adherence to such medieval authorities. The *Constitutions* (and Suárez with them) give a clear pride of place to St. Thomas, with some Jesuits interpreting this provision more strictly than others did.[34] But the position of the young Suárez toward Aquinas eventually became the norm of the Society, especially by the time of the 1599 *Ratio studiorum* that Suárez helped to revise, which states that Jesuit professors are to "follow the doctrine of St. Thomas in scholastic theology" but should "not be more tightly bound to St. Thomas than the thomists themselves."[35] Suárez thus informed the Society's reserved devotion to Aquinas, but also was formed by it. In the words of M. Forlivesi, in his approach to Aquinas, "Suárez is a perfect product of the Society of Jesus and its educational code of laws."[36]

This openness to various authorities coupled with Suárez's humanistic bent allowed him to recognize and affirm a legitimate variety of theological opinions.[37] In the third edition of his *De incarnatione* (1595), Suárez adds an introductory letter reminding his readers that it should not be shocking when Catholic authors follow and defend

[33] For example, Thomas Marschler locates the trinitarian theology of Suárez *zwischen Thomas und Scotus.* In *Die spekulative Trinitätslehre des Francisco Suárez S.J. in ihrem philosophisch-theologischen Kontext* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007), 695.

[34] Ignatius of Loyola, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, trans. George E. Ganss, S.J. (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1970), ch. 14, no. 464, 219. An account of Suárez's esteem for Aquinas as an authoritative teacher (and not just simply another author) can be found in Fichter, *Man of Spain*, 140.

[35] *Ratio studiorum*, 386, no. 2. In 1610, Acquaviva, the fifth general of the Society of Jesus, wrote to Juan Sebastián in Peru recommending that, when difficulties arise with interpreting St. Thomas, the Jesuits should in general follow the opinions of Suárez. See Antonio Astrain, S.J., *Historia de la Conpañia de Jesús en la asistencia de España* (Madrid: Rázon y Fe, 1913), vol. 4, 41.

[36] Forlivesi, "Francisco Suárez and the *rationes studiorum*," 90. Leinsle, *Introduction to Scholastic Theology*, 293, characterizes the Jesuit adoption of Aquinas as "free, eclectic, and critical."

[37] This impulse is not unique to Suárez or even to scholastics at the time. See also the Jansenist Antoine Arnauld's letter to Pierre Nicole, Letter 531, 28 August 1686, in *Oeuvres*, vol. 2, 558, discussed in Eric J. DeMeuse, "'The World Is Content with Words': Jansenism between Thomism and Calvinism," in *Beyond Dordt and* De Auxiliis: *The Dynamics of Protestant and Catholic Soteriology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. Jordan J. Ballor et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 267–68.

> diverse and often opposed opinions, for in those things which are not established with certain faith, we both permit and read that variety of opinions even among the holiest of men. And whenever the goal of everyone is the same, that is, the investigation and discovery of truth, it should not be thought that such a diversity or contrariety of opinions hinders Christian charity or arises from a disunity of souls.[38]

Save uniformity in the substance of faith, Suárez readily acknowledges valid discrepancies among theological authorities. We should not conclude, however, that throughout his career Suárez was content to let contrarieties stand. After all, the 1599 *Ratio* states not only that professors ought to "account for the [contrary] opinion of another with modesty and benevolence" but also that "if authors can be reconciled, this should be desired and not neglected."[39] Suárez thus frequently tries to synthesize and harmonize differing opinions when possible, reconciling the schools, as it were.[40] These attempts at mediation have not always won him acclaim, and there are lingering questions regarding his ability to integrate rather than merely compromise.[41] Nevertheless, Suárez's overall sober demeanor toward other thinkers and schools of thought is admirable and reflective of Ignatius' injunction at the beginning of the *Spiritual Exercises* that the Christian ought be more eager "to save the opinion of his neighbor than to condemn it."[42]

Of course, Suárez was not immune to controversy and even to occasional polemic. This feature of his approach he displays most prominently in the

[38] *De incarnatione*, "Ad eumdem de hac posteriori editione admonitio" (*Op.* 17): *Neque vero mirari te vellem, Christiane lector, cum auctores et Catholicos, et pios, diversas saepeque repugnantes sequi tuerique sententias videris; in his enim, quae certa fide non sunt stata, inter viros etiam sanctissimos eam fuisse opinionum varietatem et accepimus et legimus. Cumque idem omnium scopus sit, investigatio, videlicet, inventioque veritatis, eam opinionum sive diversitatem, sive contrarietatem, aut Christianae charitati officere, aut ex animorum disjunctione provenire, putandum non est.*

[39] *Ratio studiorum*, 380, no. 5.

[40] Suárez also employs this strategy diachronically to harmonize aspects of the tradition. He does so, however, neither facilely nor with the naïve expectation of uniformity among sources. See my "Spanish Jesuits and 'the Greeks': Reception and Perception of the Eastern Church in Luis de Molina, Francisco Suárez, and Gabriel Vásquez," *Journal of Theological Studies* 69, no. 1 (April 2018): 148–51.

[41] See, for example, Louis Bouyer's criticism of Suárez's tendency toward "quasi-diplomatic compromise . . . affirming with one mouth what he is simultaneously denying with the other," *Cosmos: The World and the Glory of God* (Petersham, MA: St. Bede's Publications, 1988), 132, as quoted in Tracey Rowland, *Catholic Theology* (London/New York: Bloomsbury, 2017), 48. Erich Przywara, S.J., *Polarity: A German Catholic's Interpretation of Religion*, trans. A. C. Bouquet, D.D. (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), 110, offers a different perspective, lauding Suárez's "basic tendency" to seek concordance, "a possible form of balance between the two opposing schools."

[42] *SpEx*, 164: *se a de presuponer que todo buen xpriano a de ser más prompto a salbar la proposición del próximo, que a condenarla.*

final work published during his lifetime, the *Defensio fidei*. In the aftermath of the infamous Gunpowder Plot of 1605, the English Parliament under James I imposed an oath of allegiance on all subjects. The oath acknowledged James as the rightful king of England and opposed the "heretical" doctrine that the pope could declare a temporal sovereign illegitimate.[43] The publication of the oath received a bevy of responses by Catholic theologians across Europe, including Bellarmine and Suárez. Suárez's response, the *Defensio fidei*, has been hailed as "the most famous and important reply" to James I, and was publicly burned in both England and France.[44] Yet even in this work Suárez avoids the pamphleteering style of reformers both Protestant and Catholic, instead employing the scholastic method used in his other works born of classroom lectures. He begins with a *quaestio*, lists opinions, offers his own response on the basis of the Scriptures, Councils, Fathers, and natural reason, and finally answers each opinion in turn.[45] In the preface of the *Defensio*, Suárez admits that

> in my manner of proceeding and disputing, I will not leave behind the style and scholastic method familiar to me and made as it were connatural to me by habit, even if that method is usually less welcome to those dissenting from us in the faith, perhaps because it is the best way for truth to be drawn out of darkness, and the most efficacious way of opposing errors.[46]

There are certainly shortcomings to this approach; namely, one wonders if a method can indeed be "most efficacious" for winning an opponent when the manner of argumentation is *minus grata* to him. Nevertheless, Suárez insists on following a method that (he thinks) permits a more thorough and effective engagement of all questions, opinions, and arguments than other methods, and for this reason he follows a similar scholastic style in all of his major works.

[43] Stefania Tutino, *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 127.

[44] Fichter, *Man of Spain*, 293, 299–301. See also J. P. Sommerville, "From Suárez to Filmer: A Reappraisal," *Historical Journal* 25, no. 3 (September 1982): 525. In France the work was condemned for its defense of papal authority. See Tutino, *Empire of Souls*, 193.

[45] See Gonzalez, *El concepto de teología*, 43.

[46] *Defensio*, preface (*Op.* 24, 2B): *in procedendi et disputandi modo, stylum et scholasticum methodum tanquam mihi familiarem, et ipsa consuetudine quasi factam connaturalem, non omittam, etiamsi hominibus a nobis in fide dissentientibus minus grata esse soleat; fortasse quia ad veritatem e tenebris eruendam aptissima est, et ad impugnandos errores efficacissima.*

I.3. Suárez's Doctrine of the Church: The State of the Question and Sources

As will be shown throughout this work, a proper understanding of Suárez's theological method is a necessary preamble for understanding his approach to ecclesiology, the scholarship concerning which pales in comparison to that dedicated to his metaphysics and legal theory. Some works have examined particular aspects of Suárez's ecclesiology such as his Eucharistic theology or his teaching on tradition and the rule of faith.[47] But the standard study is that of Francesco Spanedda (1937), who outlines the general contours of Suárez's ecclesiology with a particular focus, common for his time, on the theology of the "Mystical Body." Spanedda's study is an indispensable point of entry into Suárez's ecclesiology, though a number of points he touches on warrant deeper analysis. Spanedda does well, for example, to analyze Suárez's particular understanding of the essential unity and constitution of the Church as rooted in interior faith and, ultimately through that, in spiritual union with Jesus Christ.[48] We will return to this teaching in chapter 2. Yet Spanedda's analysis remains somewhat underdeveloped with regard to the integral relationship between the internal form of the Church and her external manifestations. This underdevelopment leads Spanedda to assess that Suárez's contribution to the question of the visibility of the Church and the ecclesial marks are "less original aspects" of his ecclesiology.[49] Consequently, Spanedda gives limited attention to Suárez's account of the Church's catholicity and the relationship between this mark and her missional nature, that is, how catholicity drives and sustains the Church's fulfillment of the missionary mandate of Christ.[50] Indeed, the scholarship has almost entirely overlooked this missional aspect of Suárez's ecclesiology.[51]

[47] Ken Yamabe, "Eucharistie und Kirche bei F. Suárez," PhD diss., University of Munich, 1974; Antonio Vargas-Muchaca, "Escritura, tradición e iglesia como reglas de fe según Francisco Suárez," PhD diss., University of Granada, 1967.

[48] Francesco Spanedda, "L'ecclesiologia di Francesco Suárez," PhD diss., Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1937, 73–74.

[49] Spanedda, "L'ecclesiologia," 13. Later, Spanedda will note what he thinks is the influence of Bellarmine on Suárez's mature ecclesiology, arguing that the latter "completes" his earlier definition of the Church by adding more external, visible elements (42). Yet Spanedda fails either to reconcile Suárez's mature position with his earlier one or to answer *why* such a shift occurred in the Spaniard's thought.

[50] Ibid., 78–79. The same could be said of the work of Gustave Thils who treats Suárez's doctrine of the *notae* but only in brief. The brevity of his treatment is understandable since Thils is writing a historical survey of the doctrine of the *notae* in early modern Catholicism. See *Les Notes de L'Église*, 222.

[51] Congar, *L'Église*, 379, fn. 28, offers a very acute insight when he remarks in a footnote that "*On trouve chez S. un écho des préoccupations nées de la mission*." Though Congar does not develop it, the insight is worthwhile and, I think, accurate. Other scholars have analyzed aspects of Suárez's

This book, then, apart from being the only in-depth study of Suárez's ecclesiology in English, proposes to be the first monograph examining Suárez's doctrine of unity and catholicity. Further, in addition to re-examining Suárez's standard ecclesiological sources, this book will also look beyond these in order to offer a more comprehensive treatment of the topic. There are two traditional sources for Suárez's ecclesiology: his lectures *De Ecclesia* (1580s) and his *Defensio fidei* (1613). The works are different genres and stem from very different moments in Suárez's career: the former classroom lectures during his tenure at the Collegio Romano,[52] the latter a polemic directed against King James I of England, written during Suárez's final years in Coimbra. This book examines both of these treatises in order to present Suárez's speculative doctrine of the unity and catholicity of the Church, noting differences and developments between them. Special attention, however, will be given to the *Defensio fidei*, wherein Suárez offers his most substantive treatment of the unity and catholicity of the Church.

Offering more than a mere speculative treatment of this topic, however, I examine how the Church's unity and missional catholicity function within Suárez's practical theology, particularly in his work *De virtute et statu religionis* (hereafter *De religione*), as well as in select moments of other treatises penned around the same time: the *De sacramentis* (1595), *De legibus* (1612), and *De fide* (1612–1613). In other words, I examine how the Church "on the ground" and in practice exhibits the dynamic between unity and catholicity. The *De religione* provides one of the best avenues for such an enterprise. Why? This work was undertaken at the behest of the Jesuit Superior General, Claudio Acquaviva, as a defense of the Society of Jesus against critics of their way of life. The Society had suffered criticisms, especially from Dominicans, since its founding, and these continued well into the seventeenth century.[53] Recognizing the need for a defense of the young order, Acquaviva wrote letters to Suárez in 1592 and again

doctrine of mission, but never in the context of the nature of the Church. See, for example, John P. Doyle, "Francisco Suárez: On Preaching the Gospel to People like the American Indians," *Fordham International Law Journal* 15, no. 4 (1991): 879–951.

[52] These lectures are included as disputations 9–11 of Suárez's lectures *De fide theologica* in *Opera omnia*, vol. 12, ed. M. André and C. Berton Paris (Ludovicus Vivès, 1856–1878), 245B [hereafter *De fide*] delivered in Coimbra from 1612–1613. Spanedda argues convincingly, however, that disputations 9–11 on the Church were lectures which Suárez delivered in Rome in 1580–1585. See "L'écclesiologia," 18–26. Joaquin Salaverri, S.J., argues that these lectures were autonomous treatises in "La eclesiología de Francisco Suarez," in *Actas del IV centenario del nacimiento de Francisco Suárez, 1548–1948*, 2 vols. (Madrid: Dirección general de propaganda, 1949), 2.51.

[53] See, for example, Tomás de Pedroche, O.P., *Censura Exercitionum S. Ignatii*, in Juan-Alphonso de Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae et rerum Societatis Jesu historia* (Matriti: Excudebat Augustinus Aurial, 1895), Volume III, Appendix 1, 509; Doris Moreno, "Crear opinion: El dominico Alonso de Avendaño y su predicación antijesuita (1567–1596)," in *Identidades y fronteras culturales en el mundo ibérico de la Edad Moderna*, ed. José Luis Beltrán, Bernat Hernández, and Doris Moreno

in 1593 asking him to take up the task.[54] There is a certain irony in Suárez being asked to defend the very *Constitutions* he was accused of violating at Valladolid. Nevertheless, Suárez complied "spontaneously" and "freely,"[55] and spent the next twenty years composing the second largest work of his career, spanning four volumes and over four thousand pages in the *Opera*.[56] In Suárez's words, this is a work of "practical" theology (*theologia . . . practica*) that shows the way in which God is to be venerated, honored, and adored, "for this was always the goal of my labors, that God may be both better known by men, and more ardently and holily worshipped."[57] In the *De religione*, Suárez proposes to treat the whole subject of *religio*, both as a virtue "common to all Christians" and as a state of life reserved for those seeking to observe the evangelical counsels.[58] It is under the heading of the "virtue" of religion that Suárez treats such acts of religion as prayer, sacrifice, Church feasts, and vows. Under the "state" of religion, Suárez touches briefly upon all the states of life contained within the Church before devoting himself to an exposition of the religious state in particular. He devotes the final part of the work to an articulation of the Jesuit charism and way of life. Thus, while not everything subsumed under the life of the Church is treated in the *De religione*, the work does purport to be a comprehensive examination of *religio*; and since *religio* is one of the essential features of the Church for Suárez,[59] it is hardly a stretch to argue that the *De religione* is, in some measure, an ecclesiological work, that is, a work of "practical ecclesiology."

My examination of both the "speculative" and "practical" aspects of Suárez's doctrine of unity and missional catholicity provides a more comprehensive account of these attributes than has heretofore been attempted in early modern

(Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2016), 402; Raoul de Scorraille, *François Suarez de la Compagnie de Jésus*, vol. 2 (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1912–1913), 139.

[54] Scorraille, *François Suarez*, I, 130–31. Luis de Molina was also asked but appears never to have responded.

[55] *De religione*, preface (*Op.* 13, 1): *Quanquam facile illud censeatur imperium, in quod animus ipse sponte propendet, atque in hoc ita libenter voluntas ferebatur, ut calcaribus non indigeret.*

[56] Fichter, *Man of Spain*, 276, writes, "Except for the problem of divine grace, Suarez gave more pages to this matter in his published works than to any other." In the letter to the reader at the beginning of his *De Deo et Trino* (*Op.* 1, xv), published in 1606, Suárez remarks that he is putting the finishing touches on the *De religione*: *Unde quamvis animus mihi sit tomos de Sacramentis absolvere, et ante illos, opus de Religione, cui ultimam manum jam adhibeo, in lucem promere*. The final edits to the last two volumes of the *De religione*, however, do not happen until closer to his death in 1615. See Scorraille, *François Suarez*, II, 141–42.

[57] *De religione*, preface (*Op.* 13, 1): *Cum enim hic semper fuerit meorum laborum scopus, ut Deus ab hominibus et cognoscatur magis, et ardentius sanctiusque colatur.*

[58] *De religione*, preface (*Op.* 13, 2).

[59] See, for example, *De legibus* 10.6.8 (*Op.* 6, 582A); *De fide* 5.6.1 (*Op.* 12, 154B); *De fide* 9.8.6 (*Op.* 12, 274B); *Defensio fidei* 1.12.3 (*Op.* 24, 62A).

studies, for I examine them not only as abstractions but as lived realities in the Church. Furthermore, this book will be the first study of the ecclesiology of the *De religione*, a work that has suffered severe neglect among scholars.[60] It is my hope, then, that Suárez's speculative ecclesiology of the *De Ecclesia* and *Defensio* will shed light on the practical ecclesiology of the *De religione* and other works, and in turn his practical ecclesiology will both enflesh his speculations and shed light on tensions between his speculative and practical thought.

Beyond the historical recovery of Suárez's ecclesiology, I also think his understanding of the Church can inform our current ecclesiological conversation in at least two ways. First, the question of "what is the Church?" undergirds any speculation on her marks. A key component of nineteenth- and twentieth-century ecclesiology was an emphasis on the Church as "mystery,"[61] leading some scholars

[60] Spanedda ("L'ecclesiologia," 75) and Yamabe ("Eucharistie und Kirche," 99–101) only look briefly at one of Suárez's descriptions of the Church in *De religione* 7.1.2.2 (*Op.* 15, 8B), but neither of them examines how this description fits into the whole structure of the *De religione* or engages other ecclesiological teachings in this work. The dearth of scholarship on the *De religione*, which Fichter says made its author "the first authority of his age on matters pertaining to religious congregations and practices" (*Man of Spain*, 276), is remarkable. William Humphrey, S.J., published a three-volume digest of the second part, the *De statu religionis*, in 1884 under the title *The Religious State: A Digest of the Doctrine of Suarez Contained in His Treatise "De Statu Religionis"* (London and New York: Burns and Oates, 1884). A number of works discuss his treatment of *religio* as a virtue; see José Pereira and Robert Fastiggi, *The Mystical Theology of the Catholic Reformation* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2006), 181; Ernst Feil, "From the Classical *Religio* to the Modern *Religion*: Elements of a Transformation between 1550 and 1650," in *Religion in History: The Word, the Idea, the Reality*, ed. Michel Despland and Gérard Vallée (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1992), 35–36; Feil, *Religio: Zweiter Band; Die Geschichte eines neuzeitlichen Grundbegriffs zwischen Reformation und Rationalismus (ca. 1540–1620)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 130–48; Giorgio Agamben, *Opus Dei: An Archaeology of Duty*, trans. Adam Kotsko (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013), 104–14; Pidel, "Francisco Suárez on Religion and Religious Pluralism." Franz Hatheyer discusses Suárez's teaching on prayer in the *De religione* in "Die Lehre des P. Suárez über Beschauung und Exstase," in *P. Franz Suarez S.J.: Gedenkblätter zu seinem dreihundertjährigen Todestag (25. September 1917)*, ed. Karl Six (Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1917), 75–122. Other authors explore Suárez's description and defense of the state of religion and the Jesuit vocation: see Francisco Cultrera, S.J., "L'obbligo di seguire la vocazione religiosa nel 'De Religione' di Francisco Suarez," PhD diss., Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1967; Miguel Nicolau, S.J., "Francisco Suárez y el estado religioso," *Manresa* 21 (1949): 121–38; the aforementioned Murphy, "'God's Porters': The Jesuit Vocation According to Francisco Suárez"; José M. Castillo, S.J., *La afectividad en los Ejercicios según la teologia de Francisco Suárez* (Granada: Archivo Teológico Granadino, 1965); and Josep Giménez Melià, S.J.'s introduction to *Los ejercicios espirituales de San Ignacio de Loyola: Una defensa*, ed. Josep Giménez Melià, S.J. (Bilbao: Mensajero, 2003), 9–30.

[61] See, for example, Matthias Joseph Scheeben, *The Mysteries of Christianity*, trans. Cyril Vollert, S.J. (St. Louis and London: Herder, 1946), 539–57; Henri de Lubac, *The Splendor of the Church*, trans. Michael Mason (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999), chapter 1, "The Church as Mystery." This emphasis on mystery is evident in the very title of chapter 1 of *Lumen Gentium*, "De Ecclesiae mysterio" (DH §4101).

to eschew *defining* the fundamental and sociological reality of the Church. Yet Joseph Komonchak has attempted to reappraise a definitional and sociological understanding of the Church as the foundation for any subsequent talk about the Church.[62] He argues that one of the oldest understandings of the Church as the *congregatio fidelium* approximates a real definition and indicates that the sociological character of the Church is primary in the order of experience.[63] This reappraisal, it will be shown in chapter 1 and again in the Conclusion, is precisely in line with the concerns of early modern Catholic ecclesiology, and it need not overlook the divine and spiritual element in the Church.

Second, the shrinking size of the Catholic Church throughout the world today has prompted theologians and pastors to focus on "mission" in the Catholic Church.[64] How can the Church reach out to the fringes of society in order to allow the light of Christ to shine more widely throughout the world? Further, if, as Vatican II says, the Church's missionary activity is "driven by the inner necessity of her own catholicity,"[65] what effect does missional ecclesiology have on our conception of catholicity, and how does catholicity affect the mark of unity? In light of this passage from the decree *Ad Gentes*, reflection on catholicity should play a central role in reflection on mission. The integral role of catholicity in the Church's mission is something explored by thinkers such as Suárez who were writing in the wake of the Reformations and during the age of European expansion. The neglect of the ecclesiology of this period is a failure to utilize the richness of the resources available to the project of missional ecclesiology. In chapters 3 and 4, I will look more deeply at how Suárez's missional ecclesiology can inform the current conversation.

I.4. Our Way of Proceeding

This book unfolds over the course of four chapters. In the first three chapters, I move back and forth between Suárez's speculative and practical ecclesiology,

[62] Joseph A. Komonchak, *Who Are the Church?: The Père Marquette Lecture in Theology 2008* (Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2008).

[63] Notably, Yves Congar states that the Church as the "people or community who form its membership" is "the meaning of *ecclesia* (church) principally used in Holy Scripture and which signifies in an exact way the congregation or the convoked assembly." This is one of the "four meanings" of the Church for Congar. See *True and False Reform in the Church*, trans. Paul Philbert, O.P. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011), 88–89.

[64] Antonio Spadaro and Carlos María Galli, eds., *For a Missionary Reform of the Church: The* Civiltà Cattolica *Seminar*, trans. Demetrio S. Yocum (New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 2017); Eugene R. Schlesinger, *Missa Est!: A Missional Liturgical Ecclesiology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017).

[65] *Ad Gentes*, 1, http://www.vatican.va: *ex intimis propriae catholicitatis exigentiis.*

usually beginning with the speculative (primarily articulated in his *Defensio*), then interweaving the practical ecclesiology (primarily from the *De religione*, but also the other aforementioned works). In the final chapter, my focus turns entirely to the *De religione*, for reasons I will articulate in this section.

In the first chapter, I exposit Suárez's description or definition of the Church as a "moral or political body" and ground this definition in the preceding tradition. I seek to demonstrate that Suárez considers the Church first and fundamentally (at least in the order of experience) a community of human pilgrims professing and living out their faith in Jesus Christ; in other words, a society of disciples of Jesus. We would be mistaken, however, to think of this "society" as a mere *place* of existence. For Suárez, rather, it is a *way* of existence (*modo existendi*). This perspective is touched on in the *Defensio* and developed further in a crucial juncture of the *De religione* where Suárez describes the Church as a lived reality (both interior and exterior), that is, as a "state of the spiritual life" and a "way of religion." The Church, for Suárez, is not just an institution or a set of laws and dogmas (though it certainly is that, too), but first and foremost a supernatural *state* and a *way* of life, begun in baptism and faith and formed through hope and charity.

Suárez's conception of the Church as a supernatural way of life directly informs his doctrine on the *essential unity and constituents of the Church*, which is explored in chapter 2. By "essential unity" I mean that bond (or "form" in scholastic parlance) which joins the members of the body of the Church to one another. By "constituents" I mean those people or groups of people who enjoy this essential bond (for Suárez, the "matter" of the Church). I thus examine the component parts of this "composite" body, focusing on the "invisible" form, which Suárez throughout his career attributes to interior faith, uniquely arguing (as distinct from Bellarmine) that it is by interior faith that one is joined to the Church. I further develop Spanedda's claim that this emphasis on faith is rooted in a deeper, Christological "form" of the Church, which also explains Suárez's later emphasis on baptism (both *in re* and *in voto*) as the correlate, primary requirement of Church membership. In keeping with his "definition" of the Church outlined in chapter 1, then, Suárez defines the essential unity of the Church primarily in terms of supernatural virtue "through which Christ inhabits our hearts," and not in terms of juridical association. Again, this juridical association is there, and necessarily so, but *as a consequence* of spiritual union with Christ. This radical emphasis on a Christological "form" or essential bond of ecclesial unity bears implications for Suárez's conception of the constituents or "matter" of the Church, particularly for those on the fringes of ecclesial membership—mortal sinners, catechumens, and schismatics. Further implications become apparent in aspects of Suárez's practical ecclesiology, particularly regarding the children of heretics, the Greeks, and those who have never heard the gospel.

Suárez's treatment of these persons, rooted in his deeply Christological conception of the Church, enables him to recognize Church membership as to some degree a scalar category, even admitting the category of *unio imperfecta*, a distant anticipation of Vatican II's recognition of degrees of communion. Finally, I conclude chapter 2 by answering a popular objection to Suárez's position, namely, that the ecclesial unity he proposes is too interior and invisible, akin in certain ways to suspect notions of the "invisible Church." Suárez indeed talks of the "invisible form" of the Church, but he admits that this "form," like every incarnate form, is always externally manifest in its operations. Suárez compares the relationship between the interior and exterior in the Church to the incarnation of the Word of God and to the sacraments. This chapter thus explicates the integral connection between interior and exterior presented in chapter 1.

The Christological form of the Church described in chapter 2, however, proves not only a centripetal but also a centrifugal principle. Chapter 3 examines the interplay between these two principles in Suárez's understanding of the catholicity of the Church, or how this body united by the bond of Christ is "catholic," a term Suárez considers synonymous with "universal or common."[66] Like his definition of the Church and his conception of ecclesial unity, catholicity is fundamentally Christological, from Suárez's earliest lectures *De Ecclesia* to his *Defensio fidei.* Nevertheless, his account of catholicity does change throughout his career, and I examine those changes and the motivations behind them. By the end of his career, Suárez highlights four particular manifestations of catholicity in the Church: the Church is universal as to the matter of her doctrine, the rule of belief or *ratio credendi*, grades and orders of persons, and place. I explore in a particular way how the Christological foundation of catholicity allows Suárez to maintain uniformity in faith and *religio* and yet to permit a great deal of variety in expressions of that faith and *religio.* This recognition and approval of diversity is manifest in Suárez's affirmation of local diversity in feasts as well as in sacramental practice, particularly in the case of "the Greeks." In both instances, Suárez points to the universality of the Church as the reason for such diversity. This diversity extends also to the persons and graces that the Church possesses. In the *Defensio*, Suárez directly links such diversity of persons and graces to an interpretation of two themes in Pauline Christology: Christ as "all in all" (Col. 3) and the variety of the members of Christ's body (Rom. 12; 1 Cor. 12). As developed in his *De religione*, this diversity is evident in the various states and ways of life present in the Church, and it exists for her adornment, such that the Church is a *regina circumdata varietate*, a queen bedecked in variety. This

[66] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.1 (*Op.* 24, 69B): *Supponimus vocem Catholica, juxta etymologiam ex graeco sumptam, idem significare quod universalis, seu communis, ut Patres omnes statim citandi in hac materia supponunt, et est adeo vulgare et receptum, ut in hoc nulla possit esse controversia.*

adornment, however, is not only useful but "necessary" for the conservation and perfection of the Church and for her mission to preach the gospel to all nations. Suárez integrates the aforementioned significations of "universality" with catholicity of place through the *missional* nature of the Church. Geographic diffusion cannot occur without the Church being comprehensive and universally persuasive in her doctrine, or without possessing a spirit of propagation for which she is equipped by her various ministries and gifts. The universality of the Church is thus ultimately a *missional catholicity* and an impulse not only to conserve but to propagate. As Suárez affirms, quoting Jerome, "if Christ does not have the Church diffused throughout the whole world . . . he is made poor beyond measure."[67]

In the final chapter, my attention turns exclusively to the final part of Suárez's *De religione*, which is his defense of the Society of Jesus. In this chapter I argue that it is in the charism of the Society of Jesus that Suárez sees the dynamic between unity and missional catholicity most fully lived out in the praxis of the Church. Not only does our discussion of ecclesial unity and missional catholicity shed light on what Suárez says about the Jesuits, but conversely what he says about the Jesuits can inform our understanding of the unity and missional catholicity of the universal Church. This converse relationship obtains not because Suárez thinks all the faithful should imitate the Society. Rather, his description of the Society informs his ecclesiology insofar as the Society is a specific determination of the ecclesial way of life, and not just *any* determination, but arguably the most excellent determination.[68] I thus look particularly at how Suárez understands the unity and universality of the Society of Jesus, noting how this understanding can enflesh our understanding of his ecclesiology. Suárez conceives of the unity of the Society as a Christological unity born of interior union with Christ expressed through exterior operations and functions (such as obedience to a "living" *regula fidei*), and he conceives of the universality of the Society as an essential part of its purpose and mission. Universality is a mark of excellence in the Society, which is "most heterogeneous" and includes within its members all kinds and degrees of persons, ministries, languages, and learning. And this universality, like the universality of the Church, is grounded in its missional nature. The Society is universal for the sake of its mission to spread the faith to the ends of the earth. This section will further enflesh Suárez's speculative discussion of the missional catholicity of the Church in chapter 3, showing how this catholicity is lived out in the Society of Jesus. It is thus in the unity and universality of

[67] *Defensio fidei* 1.4.8 (*Op.* 24, 20A): *Si Ecclesiam per totum orbem diffusam non habet Christus . . . nimium pauper factus est.*

[68] Insofar as Suárez is arguing that the Society of Jesus is a most perfect expression of one of the highest states of life (objectively speaking) within the Church.

the Society of Jesus that the unity and missional catholicity of the Church finds pronounced expression.

In the Conclusion, I reassess Suárez's legacy and the contribution he makes to the current ecclesiological conversation. In addition to tracing aspects of the Spaniard's ecclesiological legacy, I also point out how my analysis of select parts of Suárez's corpus presents an invitation to scholars to re-examine common shortcomings in the historical and theological analysis of early modern thought. An assessment of early modern ecclesiology cannot be made merely through the examination of one figure, or through the examination of one kind of literary source. This work shows the ways that expanding our figures and literary sources happily complicates the distorted image we have produced of early modern ecclesiology. Indeed, by enhancing the resolution of this early modern picture, we will be able to see the contours of post-Tridentine ecclesiology more clearly. This enhanced resolution will make more obvious not only the differences between that age and ours, but also the similarities. Finally, I suggest ways that Suárez can contribute to the current ecclesiological conversation on the two fronts mentioned earlier: the definition of the Church and the relationship between unity and missional catholicity. One of Suárez's most immediately applicable contributions is the manner in which he rejects any unhelpful bifurcation between charism and hierarchy, or the Church as a way of life and the Church as a law, or the impulse toward unity and conservation and the impulse toward mission and propagation. Suárez's understanding of these concepts, illustrated most beautifully in his description of the purpose of the Society of Jesus, demonstrates that no such bifurcations can persist in a holistic ecclesiological vision, since the respective sides of the purported chasm mutually determine each other. The decision between hunkering down to preserve the gospel and going out on mission to spread it is ultimately a false one. Indeed, any removal of one of these impulses will inevitably lead to a distortion of that which remains. Our spiritual advancement in the love of Christ can only grow if we have a truly "catholic" vision which looks outward *Ad Gentes*, and, conversely, our mission can only thrive through a "unitive" vision rooted in the theological virtues, personal conversion, and the path of holiness. It is only thus that all varieties of people will find unity in Jesus Christ, "from whom we go forth, through whom we live, and toward whom our whole life strains."[69]

[69] *Lumen Gentium* 3 (DH §4103): *a quo procedimus, per quem vivimus, ad quem tendimus.*

1

The Church as a Way of Life

1.1. Introduction

One of the fundamental theological questions facing early modern Catholicism was "What is the Church?" This question had pestered Christendom throughout the fifteenth century, reaching a high point in the Reformations of the sixteenth century.[1] Though defining the Church was not the initial concern of the Protestant reformers, it became a focal point as early as 1518, when Johann Eck pushed the question upon Martin Luther at the Leipzig Disputation.[2] Ironically, however, the question *quid est Ecclesia* went without formal definition at the Council of Trent, a silence that permitted a multiplicity of ecclesiologies—to borrow the legal formula, *qui tacet consentire videtur*, or "silence implies consent."[3] This multiplicity was not boundless, of course. According to Trent, the Church must have certain, authoritative offices, seven sacraments that convey grace, and must be one, holy, catholic, and apostolic, among other things.[4] Yet

[1] See Francis Oakley, *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church 1300–1870* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), chs. 1–2.

[2] The question of ecclesiology and papal authority was a central part of Johann Eck's strategy at the 1518 Leipzig debate with Luther, who suggests as much in his account of the debate in *Luther's Works*, American Edition, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehman (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1955–1967), vol. 31, 321. See also Eric W. Gritsch, *A History of Lutheranism* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010), 20. Luther's Roman Catholic opponents tended to push the ecclesiological question in their polemic. For a summary, see Eric J. DeMeuse, "Luther's Roman Opponents," in *Dictionary of Luther and the Lutheran Traditions*, ed. Timothy Wengert (Ada, MI: Baker Academic, 2017), 473–75.

[3] See Yves Congar, *L'Eglise de saint Augustin à l'époque moderne* (Paris: Cerf, 1970), 364; Giuseppe Alberigo, "Die Ekklesiologie des Konzils von Trient," in *Concilium Tridentinum*, ed. Remigius Bäumer (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1979), 278–300.

[4] See, for example, Council of Trent, session 3 (DH §1500).

Unity and Catholicity in Christ. Eric J. DeMeuse, Oxford University Press. © Oxford University Press 2022.
DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780197638637.003.0002

Trent did not define the relationship between conciliar and papal authority;[5] it only hinted at the ecclesiological meaning of certain sacraments;[6] it did not say what exactly makes the Church one, holy, catholic, and apostolic; and it did not explicitly prefer any ecclesiological models or metaphors over others. As might be expected, then, theologians in the ensuing decades filled this conciliar lacuna by offering their own definitions and descriptions of the Church, a phenomenon that reflected rather than truncated the multiplicity of ecclesiologies permitted by Trent.[7] This chapter will explore Suárez's contribution to the collection of ecclesial definitions that arose after Trent and will provide a foundation upon which to exposit Suárez's understanding of unity and catholicity. Suárez defines the Church in his early lectures *De Ecclesia* (1580–1585) as a congregation of the faithful, or "a political or moral body composed of men professing true faith in Christ."[8] The first part of this definition, the Church as a "political or moral body composed of men," will be the primary focus of this chapter, while the latter part will be analyzed in detail in our exposition of ecclesial unity in chapter 2.

What are the precedents within the Catholic tradition for privileging this societal image of the Church? How does Suárez understand the nature of a "moral body," and how does the Church adapt and transform this sociological and legal

[5] John W. O'Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013), 20, remarks that the debate between the authority of the papacy and that of a council of bishops was left unresolved because of "the diversity of opinions among [the Catholics] themselves."

[6] See, for example, Council of Trent, session 13 (DH §1638) on the Eucharist, . . . *adeoque symbolum unius illius corporis, cujus ipse caput exsistit, cuique nos, tamquam membra, arctissima fidei, spei et caritatis connexione adstrictos esse voluit*; session 21 (DH §1730): . . . *per baptismi lavacrum regenerati et Christo incorporati.*

[7] This multiplicity can be seen not only in the different ways in which standard early modern figures like Thomas Stapleton, Robert Bellarmine, Francisco Suárez, and Francisco Sylvius, among others, describe the essence and constitution of the Church (see Joseph Clifford Fenton, "Membership in the Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 112, no. 4 [1945]: 296–97), but also in how figures like the Oratorian Louis Thomassin (1619–1695) of the French School describes the connection between the Church and the Eucharist in his *Dogmatum theologicorum prior prodit de Verbi Dei Incarnatione* (Paris: Muguet, 1680), chs. 19–22. My project thus answers the call of Giuseppe Alberigo and Emily Michelson, "From the Council of Trent to 'Tridentinism,'" in *From Trent to Vatican II: Historical and Theological Investigations*, ed. Raymond F. Bulman et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 30, for "a rediscovery of the Tridentine context in all its richness, its contradictions, its unceasing dynamism." Nevertheless, unlike Alberigo and Michelson, I do not think that such Tridentine ecclesiologies represent a static and juridical distortion of the more dynamic ecclesiology of the Council itself (28). Rather, I consider them to operate within the spirit of Trent.

[8] *De fide* 9.1.1 (*Op.* 12, 244B): *[A]ttamen in praesenti nomine Ecclesiae utimur, quatenus significat et solam, et totam congregationem fidelium hominum in Christo credentium, quae, Psal. 21,* Ecclesia magna *dicitur, et merito* Ecclesiae militantis *nomen sibi assumpsit.* See also *De fide* 9.1.3 (*Op.* 12, 246A): *[H]aec Dei Ecclesia est corpus quoddam politicum seu morale, ex hominibus veram fidem Christi profitentibus compositum.*

category? I argue that Suárez's preferred definition of the Church as a moral body has firm roots in the Christian tradition and especially Thomas Aquinas. I then exposit Suárez's definition of a moral body as a way of life, a point developed in his *De legibus*, which is considered a key text in the development of modern political philosophy. Illuminating Suárez's teaching on the political *societas* is helpful insofar as he is partially applying this category to the Church. Yet there are moments in the *De legibus*, the *Defensio*, and the *De religione* where Suárez also breaks down the parallels between the Church and the temporal *respublica*, even implicitly arguing that the Church is more like a religious order than an earthly kingdom. The *De religione* is given particular attention because it reveals the unique way in which the Church is a supernatural society and way of life. This text supports and enfleshes Suárez's speculative definition of the Church, revealing the ecclesial society to be a "state of the spiritual life" and a "way of religion" rooted in the sacraments, the supernatural virtues, and the moral life. *De religione* further shows that the ecclesial way of life embodies a legitimate diversity of peoples and states, all striving for eternal happiness. It is here where we first encounter the Ignatian, Pauline, and Dionysian dimensions of his ecclesiology that are analyzed in later chapters. Suárez thus emerges from this chapter as a theologian who infuses sociopolitical categories with the supernatural reality of the Church but who was deeply critical of reducing the Church to a mere political society. Sociopolitical categories are helpful but ultimately inadequate for describing the Church; the old wineskins burst with the influx of new wine.

1.2. The Congregation of the Faithful and the Political Body

1.2.1. Suárez's Definition of the Church in the *De Ecclesia*

Suárez's *De Ecclesia*, classroom lectures delivered at the Collegio Romano between 1580 and 1585, presents his earliest answer to the question *quid est Ecclesia*.[9] He begins by noting the various significations of the word *Ecclesia*, a Greek word meaning a congregation of those having been called (*convocatam congregationem*).[10] The Church's having been called is what makes it different from a synagogue, which signifies, according to Suárez, any kind of congregation.[11]

[9] Francesco Spanedda, "L'ecclesiologia di Francesco Suárez," PhD diss, Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1937, 18–26.

[10] *De fide* 9.1.1 (*Op.* 12, 244A). This point is made frequently by theologians during this period, and notably in the *Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad parochos* (Rome: Paulus Manutius, 1566), 58.

[11] *De fide* 9.1.1 (*Op.* 12, 244A). A synagogue can even signify a herd of brutes and animals (*brutorum et animalium gregi*). The disctinction between the Church and the synagogue is a common way of

For Suárez, the Church is a congregation ordered from its origin by the "law of grace," which is the "law of Christ," and all who dwell therein have been "divinely called."[12] This congregation has multiple dimensions: it can include the angels and the blessed (the "Church triumphant") or refer only to the "Church militant" on earth. The *Ecclesia* can also refer to ecclesiastical superiors, to local congregations, and to the sacred places in which the faithful gather.[13] Yet in the present work, Suárez states that he uses the name Church to signify "the sole and total congregation of faithful people believing in Christ," the Church that is "in the world" as a "political or moral body composed of people professing true faith in Christ."[14] This Church is not a simple body, but a composite of matter and form. The material aspect of the Church is human pilgrims, and the form is chiefly faith, or "that by which all those who are parts of the Church are joined together into one spiritual commonwealth (*Rempublicam*)."[15] Suárez refers to all of the above as his "description or definition of the Church."[16]

Suárez does not dismiss other descriptions of the Church apart from that of a political or moral body. For example, elsewhere in the *De Ecclesia* he employs the image of the Church as spouse,[17] a garden, the ark of Noah,[18] and a flock,[19] as well as the Pauline image of a physical or organic body to highlight the diversity of members and orders in the Church.[20] Nevertheless, the description

beginning a treatise on the Church stretching back at least to the Dominican Juan de Torquemada (1388–1468), *Summa de Ecclesia* (Venice, 1561), bk. 1, ch. 1. For other examples, see Thomas Stapleton, *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium relectio scholastica & compendaria* (Antwerp: Ioannes Keerbergius, 1596), 1; and Francisco de Vitoria, *Relectiones theologiae* (Lyons: Peter Landry, 1586), *De potestate ecclesiae prior*, sec. 1, 1–2. The section of the *Relectiones* in question, the *De potestate ecclesiae prior*, was delivered in Salamanca in 1532, *Vitoria: Political Writings*, ed. Anthony Pagden and Jeremy Lawrence (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 45.

[12] *De fide* 9.1.1 (*Op.* 12, 244B and 245A): *Quia scilicet nullus ad illam adjungitur, nisi divinitus vocatus.* On the synonyms Suárez permits for *lex gratiae*, see *De legibus* 10, preface (*Op.* 6, 550A).

[13] *De fide* 9.1.1 (*Op.* 12, 244B).

[14] *De fide* 9.1.1 (*Op.* 12, 244B): *attamen in praesenti nomine Ecclesiae utimur, quatenus significat et solam, et totam congregationem fidelium hominum in Christo credentium. De fide* 9.1.2 (*Op.* 12, 245A): *Dico primo: certum est veram Dei Ecclesiam in mundo esse. . . . Dico secondo: haec Dei Ecclesia est corpus quoddam politicum seu morale, ex hominibus veram fidem Christi profitentibus compositum.*

[15] *De fide* 9.1.3 (*Op.* 12, 245A): *Nimirum Ecclesia corpus quoddam est non simplex, sed compositum. . . . Pars igitur materialis hujus corporis sunt homines viatores, quia solum de Ecclesia quae nunc militat loquimur; forma vero est illa qua omnes, qui partes Ecclesiae sunt, in unum spiritualem Rempublicam conjunguntur; haec autem forma fides est praecipue*. The language of matter and form is also the language Aquinas and Suárez use for the anthropological composition of body and soul.

[16] *De fide* 9.1.3 (*Op.* 12, 245B).

[17] *De fide* 9.3.3 (*Op.* 12, 256B).

[18] *De fide* 9.7.1–2 (*Op.* 12, 270B); also 9.5.3 (*Op.* 12, 261A).

[19] *De fide* 9.9.10 (*Op.* 12, 278A).

[20] *De fide* 9.5.3 (*Op.* 12, 261A): *[Paulus] comparat Ecclesiam corpori humano*; *De fide* 9.9.10 (*Op.* 12, 278[a]): *veram Christi Ecclesiam esse corpus organicum.*

of the Church militant as a "political or moral body"—alternately *respublica* or *societas*—holds precedence over others, as evident from an important passage written around the same time in Suárez's first published work, the *De incarnatione* (1590).[21] Here Suárez provides an exposition of Aquinas' question in the *Summa theologiae* on whether Christ is the head of the Church.[22] Following Aquinas, Suárez begins by noting that the appellation "head" is a metaphor insofar as it applies to the Church, and thus it must be understood what is signified by that metaphor.[23] Suárez enumerates three conditions wherein the head of the mystical or moral body imitates the head of a natural body—order, perfection, and power. The last of these, signified by the expression *in alia membra influat*, he deems the chief point of comparison between the mystical and natural head, though not to the exclusion of the other two points (order and perfection).[24] It is notable that throughout this commentary Suárez is presuming that Christ's headship over the Church is a "mystical or moral" (*mystico seu morali*) headship that imitates, in certain respects, the operations of a natural head. In the words of Aquinas, the whole Church "is called one mystical body through a similitude to the natural human body."[25] The Church as "mystical body," which Suárez equates with "moral body" in this passage, is the primary and foundational concept being compared to a natural head and body. The Church takes on the attributes of a natural body only "metaphorically" or "through a similitude." Thus, Suárez is not employing the natural and moral body images as separate, parallel concepts. Instead, the anatomical image is applied metaphorically to the Church to shed light on realities *within* the foundational ecclesial definition in play, that of a *congregatio*, a mystical or moral body.

Yet why does Suárez privilege the description of the Church as a congregation or moral body? Charles Journet suggests that for Suárez, the moral body description serves as much a negative purpose as a positive one: Suárez is emphasizing

[21] The *De incarnatione* takes the form of a commentary on the *Tertia pars* of Thomas Aquinas' *Summa theologiae.*

[22] Aquinas, *ST* III, q. 8, a. 1.

[23] *De incarnatione*, q. 8, a. 1, no. 1 (*Op.* 17, 638A): *Quoniam haec capitis appellatio metaphorica est, non potest proprie de ea disputari, nisi prius constet, quid per illam metaphoram significetur*; Aquinas, *ST* III, q. 8, a. 1, corpus and ad 2.

[24] *De incarnatione*, q. 8, a. 1, no. 1 (*Op.* 17, 638B): *ideo merito D. Thomas in hoc articulo ad tres conditiones reduxit rationem capitis, in quibus hoc caput mysticum naturale caput imitatur, scilicet, ut sit aliquo modo primum in ordine, et excedat perfectione, et in alia membra influat; quaerere ergo an Christus sit caput, nihil aliud est quam quaerere an habeat has tres conditiones, et praecipua difficultas est de tertia, tum quia illa est quae praecipue attenditur in capite, praesertim mystico seu morali; tum etiam quia de aliis duabus conditionibus satis ex superioribus constat, eas in Christo reperiri.*

[25] Aquinas, *ST* III, q. 8, a. 1, corpus, as cited accurately by Suárez in *De incarnatione*, q. 8, a. 1 (*Op.* 17, 637B).

that the unity of the Church is *not* a physical or substantial unity.[26] The text of the *De incarnatione* seems to support this interpretation. Yet even here Suárez goes farther than a mere negative judgment by equating the "mystical body," whatever that may be, with a "moral body," a conflation not explicitly made by Aquinas or, for example, by the Dominican commentator Tomasso de Vio Cajetan.[27] Suárez's *De incarnatione* does not provide an explanation for the conflation of mystical and moral, nor does the *De Ecclesia.* Indeed, the latter source makes no defense of the moral body. Yet perhaps there is a hidden *ratio* in this silence. A defense tends to be leveraged when the need for a defense arises. But Suárez asserts that the "true Church of God is in the world," and that this claim is clear "from all the Creeds, Councils, and Scriptures which we will cite, and in this the heretics agree with us."[28] Suárez then goes on for the next eight pages defending the second part of his definition, that the formal cause of the Church is faith, a claim over which there is "great controversy."[29] The material cause of the Church, and the fact that this material cause is united and ordered by a form of some kind, warrants no defense by Suárez. Even in his section on whether the Church of Christ is visible, Suárez asserts that "there is agreement between us and the heretics that the Church of which we speak, taken in a vague sense, is a congregation of humans, and therefore it consists of corporeal and visible persons."[30] This is a very important if elementary statement. The early modern emphasis on the Church as a political or moral body does not, at least for Suárez, arise out of Reformation controversy.[31] Rather, the Church as a congregation of

[26] Charles Journet, *L'Église du Verbe incarné*, vol. 2, *Sa structure interne et son unité catholique* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1951), 594, n. 2: "L'unité de l'Église *n'est pas une unité substantielle*. . . . C'est aussi ce que veut dire Suárez lorsqu'il définit l'Église 'un corps politique ou moral.' " Pope Pius XII's *Mystici corporis Christi* (1943), §61, clearly affirms that the unity of the Church is not physical or substantial.

[27] See Cajetan's commentary in *Angelici doctoris S. Thomae Aquinatis Summa theologica, cum commentariis Thomae de Vio Card. Cajetani et Elicidationibus Litteralibus P. Seraphini Capponi a Porrecta, Ordinis Praedicatorum: Tomus Septimus continens Tertiae partis volumen primum* (Rome: 1773), vol. 7, 146–47. Cajetan writes that Paul applies the image of a natural body to the Church only metaphorically, but Cajetan does not say what kind of body the Church is if not natural. Aquinas suggests an ordered multitude at *ST* III, q. 8, a. 1, ad 2.

[28] *De fide* 9.1.2 (*Op.* 12, 245A): *certum est veram Dei Ecclesiam in mundo esse. Haec est de fide, ut patet ex omnibus Symbolis, Conciliis, et Scripturis, quae adferemus, et in ea haeretici nobiscum conveniunt.*

[29] *De fide* 9.1.5 (*Op.* 12, 246A).

[30] *De fide* 9.8.1 (*Op.* 12, 272B): *Convenit igitur nobis cum haereticis, Ecclesiam, de qua loquimur, confuse sumptam, esse hominum congregationem, atque adeo constare ex personis corporeis et visibilibus.* In his *De opere sex dierum* 5.7.1 (*Op.* 3, 413B), Suárez equates the "corporeal" and "political" life in his question *Quod genus vitae corporalis, seu politicae, homines in statu innocentiae profiterentur.*

[31] That building an ecclesiology *contre* the Reformers caused the overriding consideration of the Church as a *société* is suggested in Congar's conclusion to the section on "La contre-réforme" in *L'Église*, 381.

human persons called forth into an ordered body is simply the fundamental idea conveyed by the word *Ecclesia*, a definition inherited from Suárez's medieval predecessors Thomas Aquinas, Juan de Torquemada, and Gabriel Biel,[32] and maintained by his scholastic contemporaries[33] and the authors of the catechism of the Council of Trent.[34] All of these figures, like Suárez, recognize that the word *Ecclesia* is multidimensional, yet they all maintain the need for a fundamental description, the *congregatio fidelium*, upon which to develop their understandings of the Church in the world. Consequently, such Catholic thinkers did not feel the need, as Quentin Skinner argues, "to confront and demolish" the "Lutheran" contention "that the true Church is nothing more than a *congregatio fidelium*," since the description *congregatio fidelium* was a near universal and non-polemical way of describing the Church.[35] For Suárez this fact is only too obvious. While

[32] Aquinas describes the Church primarily as a *congregatio fidelium* in his *Expositio in symbolum Apostolorum*, art. 9. Juan de Torquemada similarly speaks of the Church primarily as a *collectio fidelium* in *Summa de Ecclesia*, bk. 1, chs. 1–3, at 3A and 4A, and Gabriel Biel employs Aquinas' language of a *congregatio fidelium* in *Canonis misse expositio*, ed. Heiko Oberman and William J. Courtenay (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1963), 198–99. Notably, Yves Congar states that the Church as the "people or community who form its membership" is "the meaning of *ecclesia* (church) principally used in Holy Scripture and which signifies in an exact way the congregation or the convoked assembly." This sense of the term is proposed as one of "four meanings" of the Church in *True and False Reform in the Church*, trans. Paul Philbert, O.P. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011), 88–89.

[33] Melchior Cano, O.P., *De locis theologicis libri duodecim* (Louvain: Servatius Sassenus, 1564), bk. 4, 223, describes the Church militant as a *coetus fidelium viatorum* (both Yves Congar, O.P., *L'Église,* 379, and Joaquin Salaverri de la Torre, S.J., "La eclesiología de Francisco Suarez," 51, cite Cano as an influence on Suárez's ecclesiology); Francisco de Vitoria, *Relectiones theologicae, De potestate ecclesiae prior*, sec. 1, 3, defines *Ecclesia* as *fidelium communitas, sive Respublica*; Thomas Stapleton, *A Fortresse of the Faith* (Antwerp: Ihon Laet, 1565), 55, speaks of the "the people of the Messias, of his Churche, and faythfull congregation"; Gregory of Valencia, S.J., *Analysis Fidei Catholicae* (Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1605), 121–22, refers to the Church both in a broad and narrow sense as a *hominum multitudo.* Bellarmine's *De controversiis*, vol. 2, controversy 1, bk. 3, ch. 2, 52C and 53D, published after Suárez composed his treatise *De Ecclesia*, begins with a description of the Church as a *coetus fidelium* and *coetus hominum.*

[34] *Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad parochos* (Rome: Paulus Manutius, 1566), 58 and 59: *Communi uero deinde sacrarum scripturarum consuetudine haec vox [ecclesia] ad remp[ublicam] Christianam, fideliumque tantum congregationes significandas usurpata est. . . . Militans vero Ecclesia est coetus omnium fidelium*. For a synopsis of the history of the Roman Catechism, see the "Introduction" in *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*, trans. John A. McHugh, O.P., and Charles J. Callan, O.P. (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, 1936).

[35] Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought,* vol. 2, *The Age of Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 138. Skinner is somewhat closer to the truth when he qualifies that what was repudiated was a "consequent rejection of all ecclesiastical hierarchies," but he fails to point out that a mere *congregatio* does not entail such a "consequent rejection." For Suárez, it is the exact opposite: a *congregatio* without hierarchy is not a *congregatio.* Even many Protestants affirm the necessity of a hierarchy for the preservation of a congregation. The Augsburg Confession, *The Book of Concord*, ed. Robert Kolb et al., trans. Charles Arrand et al. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010), articles 7, 8, and 14, includes the "preaching" of the word and "administering" of the sacraments by those

the Church can never be reduced to her material cause, the Church is also never *other* than her material cause; she can never be divorced from her body. In other words, the Church never exists apart from the real people who constitute her, from the time of Adam when the Church arose with the first human society (*formata Eva*), throughout the ages of history, and into eternity.[36]

1.2.2. The Political or Moral Body in Suárez's *De legibus* and *Defensio fidei*

The people who constitute the material cause of the Church, however, are more than a mere aggregate; they are called and united by faith into a political body. Suárez explains the difference between an aggregate and a political body in his *De legibus* (1612). In book 3, which concerns human or civil law, Suárez distinguishes between two kinds of human multitudes (*multitudinem hominum*). The first kind of multitude is an "aggregate without any order, without any physical or moral union," elsewhere described as an accidental (*per accidens*) or confused (*confuse*) collection of people—think of a crowd gathered in a public market.[37] This multitude can hardly be considered a political body and consequently does not require a head or leader formally possessing political power.[38] The second kind of multitude is made up of people "congregated with a specific will or common consent into one political body by a social bond, and in order to mutually help one another in an ordered way toward a political end." This multitude makes "one mystical body that can be called *per se* one in a moral sense" and thus requires for its perdurance political governance or an order for the sake of such governance.[39] This distinction between two human multitudes exactly

"properly called" in its conception of the church. John Calvin, *Opera selecta: Institutionis Christianae religionis*, ed. Petrus Barth and Guilelmus Niesel (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2018 [1559]), vol. 5, bk. 4, ch. 3, no. 2, writes: *His verbis* [*Eph. 4*] *illud* [*Paulus*] *ostendit hominum ministerium, quo Deus in gubernanda Ecclesia utitur, praecipuum esse nervum quo fideles in uno corpore cohaereant.*

[36] *De fide* 9.2.3 (*Op.* 12, 254A): *Ecclesia produci incepit in Adamo, et, formata Eva, proprie dici potuit Ecclesiam esse*; *De fide* 9.3.1 (*Op.* 12, 255B): *. . . neque minimo tempore interrupta fuit, in quo non fuerit in mundo aliqua fidelium congregatio*; and *De fide* 9.3.4 (*Op.* 12, 257A): *Ecclesia simpliciter dicitur perpetua.*

[37] *De legibus* 3.3.6 (*Op.* 5, 183A); *De opere sex dierum* 5.7.3 (*Op.* 3, 414A). See Harro Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540–1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 250.

[38] *De legibus* 3.2.4 (*Op.* 5, 181A): *aggregatum quoddam sine ullo ordine, vel physica, vel morali . . . et ideo non sunt proprie unum corpus politicum, ac proinde non indigent uno capite aut principe. Quapropter in eis consideratis hoc modo nondum intelligitur haec potestas proprie ac formaliter, sed ad summum quasi radicaliter.*

[39] *De legibus* 3.2.4 (*Op.* 5, 181A): *hominum multitudo . . . speciali voluntate seu communi consensu in unum corpus politicum congregantur uno societatis vinculo, et ut mutuo se juvent in ordine ad unum finem*

matches Suárez's distinction between the Church and the synagogue in the *De Ecclesia*: the one an ordered convocation, the other a mere aggregate (*grex*). The *De legibus* text further reflects the conflation of "mystical" and "moral" evident in Suárez's *De incarnatione*, but in this case unites them in a strictly political context. For Suárez, every moral body is a mystical body.[40] This title is not reserved for the Church.

What distinguishes a moral or mystical body from an aggregate is the common consent of the people who bind themselves together in service to one another. The development of political governance and positive law, then, does not precede but *follows upon* the moral consent of human wills (*speciali voluntate seu communi consensu*) to pursue a certain social way of life.[41] Yet we must be careful not to bifurcate the moral pact with political governance and subordination too starkly. While Suárez *does* distinguish a second, consequent compact by the community "required by a would-be ruler to hold office," nevertheless the first act of consent previously described—what Daniel Schwarz calls "constitutive consent"—already establishes a political body *and with it* political power and subordination.[42] Thus Harro Höpfl accurately observes that Suárez nowhere indicates that the consent of the people and the establishment of political power/subordination are "two distinguishable compacts."[43] Suárez writes in the *De opere sex dierum*, finished sometime after 1613,[44] that a political union "does not arise without some expressed or tacit pact of helping each other, nor without some subordination of each family and person to some superior or director of the community, without which such a community cannot exist."[45] On

politicum, quomodo efficiunt unum corpus mysticum, quod moraliter dici potest per se unum: illudque consequenter indiget uno capite. . . . Quia sine gubernatione politica vel ordine ad illam non potest intelligi unum corpus politicum.

[40] See also *De legibus* 1.6.17 (*Op.* 5, 27B): *communitas est corpus mysticum.*

[41] Unlike later protagonists of contract theory, Suárez presents this sequence as natural in his *De opere sex dierum* and not the result of human sinfulness or strife. See Matthew T. Gaetano's introduction to "What Kind of Corporeal or Political Life Men Would Have Professed in the State of Innocence," trans. Matthew T. Gaetano, *Journal of Markets & Morality* 15, no. 2 (Fall 2012): 527–63. On the relationship between Suárez and Locke, see Catherine S. Kuiper, " 'Through the Features of Men's Faces': The Political Community in Francisco Suárez and John Locke," PhD diss, University of Notre Dame, 2016.

[42] Daniel Schwarz, "Francisco Suárez on Consent and Political Obligation," *Vivarium* 46 (2000): 62.

[43] Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought*, 251.

[44] Joseph Fichter, *Man of Spain: Francis Suarez* (New York: Macmillan, 1940), 327.

[45] *De opere sex dierum* 5.7.3 (*Op.* 3, 414A): *Alius ergo modus multiplicationis familiarum, seu domorum, est cum distinctione domestica, et aliqua unione politica, quae non fit sine aliquo pacto expresso, vel tacito juvandi se invicem: nec sine aliqua subordinatione singularum familiarum et personarum ad aliquem superiorem, vel rectorem communitatis, sine quo talis communitas constare non potest.*

the one hand, then, the union of wills conceptually precedes the development of governing structures and positive law. On the other hand, a mere union of wills lacking political power and subordination would yield only an aggregate until some level of governance and laws were established. Though conceptually distinct, the moral pact and political subordination remain inseparable in reality.[46] An ordered, social way of life cannot exist without law and governance, without a rule of living and a living rule, or some authority to oversee and arbitrate the community's way of life.[47]

The union of will and governance integral to a political body obviates any necessity for local proximity among members. Earlier in the *De legibus*, Suárez describes the difference between a perfect and an imperfect community. Suárez defines a perfect community as capable of political governance and sufficient in its own order, for example, a city or a kingdom.[48] A perfect community can be "real or local," that is, confined by certain geographical bounds, or it can be "personal, since the community is considered more in the person than in a place." Suárez uses the example of a religious community (*religio*) to describe the latter.[49] In either case, however, it is not local proximity that makes a political body; it is the communal union of purpose coupled with governance; it is the intentional, ordered, and social way of life. The moral bond uniting such a community is so strong, in fact, that Suárez compares the political body to a *persona*, albeit an "imaginary person" or *persona ficta.*

The notion of a *persona ficta* arose in the medieval Church and was cemented by Pope Innocent IV (1195–1254), who used it to clarify the canonical status of a *universitas.*[50] In his *De legibus*, Suárez applies the category of the *persona ficta*

[46] On this point, see Schwarz, "Francisco Suárez on Consent and Political Obligation," 60–61.

[47] Suárez refers to law as a *regula operandi* in *De legibus* 1.6.17 (*Op.* 5, 27B); see also *De legibus* 10.1.7 (*Op.* 6, 552B). Suárez frequently refers to the judge as a *quasi lex viva* or *quasi animata lex*; see, for example, *De legibus* 5.6.9 (*Op.* 5, 435B); 5.11.3 (*Op.* 5, 466B). Stefania Tutino, *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 44, describes the integral relationship between a society and the necessary authority that preserves that society as a position Suárez shared with "an entire Jesuit and Dominican school of theorists."

[48] *De legibus* 1.6.19 (*Op.* 5, 28B): *Perfecta [communitas] in genere dicitur, quae est capax politicae gubernationis, quae, quatenus talis est, dicitur sufficiens in hoc ordine.*

[49] *De legibus* 1.6.19 (*Op.* 5, 28B): *inter has communitates quaedam dicuntur reales, seu locales, quia certis terminis realibus seu localibus clauduntur, ut est civitas, vel regnum: aliae vero dicuntur personales, quia magis in personis quam in locis considerantur, ut est religio aliqua, verbi gratia, vel confraternitas, etc., quae possunt esse etiam perfectae communitates, si perfectum regimen et moralem unionem habeant.*

[50] See Frederic William Maitland's introduction to Otto Gierke, *Political Theories of the Middle Ages*, trans. Frederic William Maitland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900), xix; Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957), 305–6.

to the moral body as a whole.[51] When a moral body is established by a "specific will" and "common consent" of a people, the body then possesses a single will (*voluntate*) and purpose as well as a governing power that did not heretofore exist in the individual members or the aggregate.[52] In short, the political body is a *novum* that cannot be reduced to the sum of its component parts.

This newness of the political body arises from a divine source operating within human action. In the *Defensio fidei*, Suárez affirms that political power is given to the perfect political community "immediately by God,"[53] and thus the political community bears an obligation to God.[54] This fact should be borne in mind when Suárez conflates the terms "moral" and "mystical" throughout his works. While such a conflation appears to muddy an expression properly reserved for the Church or the Eucharist, it also and conversely elevates the domain of the political. There is no purely secular realm for Suárez; all authority, even civil, comes from God and bears the "whiff of incense from another world," as Ernst Kantorowicz so eloquently puts it.[55] Nevertheless, for Suárez, this divinely given

[51] *De legibus* 1.6.17 (*Op.* 5, 27B): *si tamen communitas perfecta sit, ut statim dicam; tum . . . illa dicatur una persona ficta*. . . . Alfred Rahilly, "Suarez and Democracy," *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 7, no. 25 (March 1918): 3, is correct, however, that Suárez generally prefers to speak of the community as a political body rather than a person. Suárez elsewhere uses the term *persona ficta* to refer to the governing council of a political body. See *Defensio fidei* 3.1.5 (*Op.* 24, 204B): *potestam unam intelligimus . . . sive in uno consilio, seu congregatione plurium tanquam in una persona ficta*. . . . The idea of the *persona ficta* can be seen in later political theorists. See, for example, Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 7, where he speaks of the commonwealth as "an artificial man."

[52] *De legibus* 3.11.7 (*Op.* 5, 213B): *haec naturalis potestas condendi humanas leges non est in singulis hominibus per se spectatis, nec in multitudine hominum aggregata solum per accidens; sed est in communitate, ut moraliter unita et ordinata ad componendum unum corpus mysticum, et ex illo resultat tanquam proprietas ejus*; see also *De legibus* 3.3.6 (*Op.* 5, 183A) and Theo Kobusch's analysis of "Die ontologische Entdeckung der Institution" in "Die Lehre vom moralischen Sein in der Philosophie des F. Suarez," in *Die Entdeckung der Person: Metaphysik der Freiheit und modernes Menschenbild* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1993), 63–66, esp. 65.

[53] *Defensio fidei* 3.2.6 (*Op.* 24, 208A).

[54] *Defensio fidei* 3.5.2 (*Op.* 24, 225A): *Quia vero felicitas temporalis et civilis ad spiritualem et aeternam referenda est, ideo fieri potest ut materia ipsa potestatis civilis aliter dirigenda et gubernanda sit, in ordine ad spirituale bonum, quam sola civilis ratio postulare videatur*. From this position Suárez develops his theory of the indirect (*indirecta*) power of the pope over temporal sovereigns. Earlier in the *Defensio fidei* 3.1.7 (*Op.* 24, 205B), Suárez refers to earthly kings as *ministri Dei*.

[55] *The King's Two Bodies*, 210. Kuiper makes the same point via Kantorowicz in the conclusion of her dissertation, " 'Through the Features of Men's Faces.'" Thus, for example, Suárez argues that civil law can prescribe some of the moral virtues (though not prohibit all vice contrary to the virtues), in *De legibus* 3.12.9–11 (*Op.* 5, 218B-19B). Peter Marshall, *Heretics and Believers* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017), xi, writes: "That religious symbolism or argument sometimes patently served what we might regard as political or economic ends should be regarded as demonstrating the depth of religious importance, rather than exposing its precarious shallowness."

authority does *not* make the political *novum* a supernatural institution. The "gift" (*donatio*) of the political body is not a positive, divine institution distinct from the natural order, but arises from God working through the natural creative power (*vis*) of a people's will.[56] The power of the political body comes immediately from God, but "as he is the author and caretaker of nature."[57] Thus, positive human law *directly* concerns only the things of nature and does not impose spiritual laws proximately ordered to supernatural beatitude.[58]

1.2.3. The Church as the New Commonwealth in the *Defensio fidei* and *De legibus*

The principal object of the Church, however, is to order souls to beatitude.[59] How, then, can Suárez justify his identification of the ecclesial *congregatio* as a moral or political body, a position he maintains from his *De Ecclesia* lectures until his 1613 *Defensio fidei*, where he writes that "the universal Church of Christ is no less one, or one kingdom in its own order, than any other temporal kingdom in its order"?[60] Jacob W. Wood employs this passage to argue that Suárez reduces the Church to "an ecclesial nation-state" in contradistinction to Henri de Lubac's notion of the Church as a "*communion* of people . . . who therefore freely and willing [*sic*] enter into communion with the one God in one ecclesial community."[61] Wood, however, fails to address exactly what the Church's "own order" is in comparison to the order of the temporal kingdom, which a closer reading of Suárez would have revealed. Suárez immediately clarifies the quoted passage from the *Defensio*, adding that the Church is a "spiritual kingdom" as to its end (beatitude) and particular means (grace), but as to the persons who constitute it, the Church is terrestrial. This passage supports the argument from silence suggested by his much earlier *De Ecclesia* that the comparison between the Church and an earthly kingdom primarily arises from Suárez's guiding presumption that the Church cannot be considered apart from her material cause, that is, the faithful people. Insofar as the faithful participate in a certain way of

[56] *Defensio* 3.2.5 (*Op.* 24, 207B).

[57] *Defensio fidei* 3.2.6 (*Op.* 24, 208A): *ergo [haec potestas] datur immediate a Deo, ut est auctor et provisor talis naturae.* See also *De legibus* 3, preface (*Op.* 5, 175B).

[58] *De legibus* 3.11.6 (*Op.* 5, 213A). See also Jean-Paul Coujou, "Political Thought and Legal Theory in Suárez," in *A Companion to Francisco Suárez,* ed. Victor M. Salas and Robert L. Fastiggi (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 34.

[59] *Defensio fidei* 3.6.6 (*Op.* 24, 232B).

[60] *Defensio fidei* 3.6.10 (*Op.* 24, 234A): *Ecclesia Christi universa non minus est una, seu regnum unum in suo ordine, quam sit regnum quodlibet temporale in suo.*

[61] Jacob W. Wood, "The Five-Hundredth Anniversary of the Reformation: A Catholic Perspective," in *Reformation Observances: 1517–2017,* ed. Philip D. W. Krey (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2017), 79, 89.

life through their freely willed actions, such actions must be governed by a *regula* (law) and a *regula viva* (Christ in the person of the Pontiff and bishops) guiding them toward their proper and supernatural end.[62] Accordingly, the Church may be considered a political or moral body, that is, a social and corporeal way of life ordered by some sort of unitive bond and governing structures. This ecclesial moral body, a "perfect community," is not local but personal, since she has no geographical bounds but "contains within herself various kingdoms and commonwealths" lacking temporal unity among themselves.[63] This passage read in light of the examples of a perfect community proffered in the *De legibus* suggests that the ecclesial congregation would actually be more like a religious order (*religio*) than a nation-state. As Suárez writes in the *Defensio*, citing Prosper of Aquitaine, "Christian grace was not content to have the same boundaries as Rome, and grace subjected many peoples with the scepter of the cross whom Rome never conquered with her weapons."[64] This grace of common faith and governance directed toward a supernatural goal puts the Church in a different order from that of temporal kingdoms; this grace, therefore, is what makes the reduction of the Church to a temporal state inconceivable for Suárez. In fact, his notion of the Church agrees with that of de Lubac underlined by Wood.[65]

Suárez further stretches the relationship between the Church and a temporal kingdom in the final book of his *De legibus*, which is on "the new divine law," a

[62] *Defensio fidei* 3.6.10 (*Op.* 24, 234A): *Et licet Ecclesia quoad finem et praecipua media spirituale regnum sit, nihilominus, quoad personas ex quibus constat, etiam est terrestris, et actiones, in quibus regi, vel dirigi et corrigi debet, terrestres etiam sunt, id est, externae et sensibiles, et illis mediantibus servanda est pax, unitas, religio, et caetera omnia quae ad convenientem hujus corporis gubernationem sunt necessaria; ergo non minus est in hoc regno necessaria potestas suprema, quae humano et sensibili modo membra ejus et actiones eorum in ordine ad aeternam salutem dirigat et gubernet.* Journet recognizes this position when he writes, "Quand Suárez définit l'Église un *corps moral*, il est manifeste qu'il pense à un corps moral *surnaturel*, et donc mystique" (*L'Église*, 486–87, n. 1). On the need for a *regula viva* in the Church, see Suárez's Coimbra lectures *De fide* 5.5 (*Op.* 12, 152A–54B).

[63] *Defensio fidei* 3.5.11 (*Op.* 24, 228A): *At congregatio Ecclesiae licet sit unum corpus spirituale seu mysticum Christi, et in hoc genere habeat fidei, baptismatis et capitis unitatem, non tamen est unita in ratione unius politicae congregationis, sed in se continet varia regna et respublicas, quae in politico genere nullam inter se habent unitatem.*

[64] *Defensio fidei* 3.5.7 (*Op.* 24, 226B): *Gratia christiana non contenta est eosdem limites habere quos Roma, multosque populos sceptro crucis subdidit, quos armis suis ipsa non domuit.*

[65] The distinction that Suárez draws between the Church and the temporal state further pushes back against the analysis of Reinhold Schwarz, *Die eigenberechtigte Gewalt der Kirche* (Rome: Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1974), 50–52. While Schwarz is correct that *kein gesellschaftlicher Dualismus intendiert ist, worin Kirche und Staat als zwei heterogene Mächte einander gegenüberstehen*, nevertheless he goes too far in summarizing that *Noch scheint auch Suarez die Einheit beider vor Augen zu haben, wenn er von der Ecclesia spricht*. As will be shown in chapter 3, temporal power still bears a relationship to the Church. Yet as demonstrated in this chapter, the power of the Church remains distinct from temporal power, and ultimately ordered to a different immediate end.

term Suárez alternately refers to as the "law of faith" because "this law has within itself spirit and grace, the foundation and root of which is faith."[66] Justifying the need for a law of some sort in the Church, Suárez affirms that Christ instituted the Church as a spiritual commonwealth and mystical body in which He himself reigns as head.[67] Suárez adds that

> since the Church is a new commonwealth congregated in a new way and ordained to the highest end, it pertained to the wise providence of Christ her founder and to the perfection and stability of his Church to have from its founder some law . . . since without law [such a community] cannot be morally preserved in its unity.[68]

Like every human community, the Church requires a governing head and a law in order to preserve the bond joining her constituent members.[69] Yet on every level of her order, the Church is a *novum*: she is a new commonwealth, congregated in a new way and ordered by a new law.[70] Unlike the political body whose "newness" arises out of the natural force of a communal pact, the Church is congregated by a divine call, instituted by the incarnate God, and united by the supernatural gift of faith. Notably, it is this section of his *De legibus* which is invoked centuries later at the First Vatican Council to argue for the Church as a true, *spiritual*, society.[71]

[66] *De legibus* 10.1.8 (*Op.* 6, 552B) : *Dicitur ergo lex fidei, quia in se habet spiritum et gratiam, cujus fundamentum et radix est fides.* Suárez asserts in the same place that this faith renders the precepts of the new law sweet (*suavia*) rather than burdensome (*gravia*).

[67] *De legibus* 10.1.7 (*Op.* 6, 552A): *Christus Dominus . . . Ecclesiam suam instituit tanquam unam spiritualem rempublicam in qua ipse regnaret, et unum corpus mysticum in quo ipse esset caput.*

[68] *De legibus* 10.1.7 (*Op.* 5, 552B): *Cum ergo Ecclesia sit nova respublica novo modo congregata, et ad altissimum finem ordinata, pertinuit ad sapientem providentiam Christi fundatoris ejus, et ad ejusdem Ecclesiae perfectionem et stabilitatem, habere a suo fundatore aliquam legem . . . quia sine lege non posset in sua unitate moraliter conservari.*

[69] Defending the need for divine positive law to be promulgated, Suárez writes in *De legibus* 10.4.9 (*Op.* 6, 569B): *Propriissime autem necessaria est promulgatio in lege positiva, non quia est humana vel divina, sed quia hominibus datur, et secundum ordinariam providentiam debet modo hominibus accommodato illos obligare.*

[70] Suárez distinguishes the new law from canonical law, the latter of which pertains primarily to the juridical, ecclesiastical power in the Church entrusted to Christ's Vicar. See *De legibus* 10.2.2 (*Op.* 6, 554B); 1.4.21 (*Op.* 5, 13A).

[71] Amidst the debates concerning the nature of the Church as a "true, perfect, spiritual and supernatural society" for the drafted schema *De Ecclesia*, the Council Fathers invoked the authority of Suárez to defend the notion of the Church as a "true *spiritual* society," citing a long passage from *De legibus* 10.1.7 (*Op.* 6.552). On the legacy of Suárez at Vatican I, see Joaquin Salaverri, "Autoridad de Suárez en el Concilio Vaticano," *Estudios eclesiásticos* 22 (1948), particularly at 213. For the text of the schema, see "The First Draft of the Constitution on the Church of Christ," in *The Teaching of the*

This description of the new law is pivotal for grasping how the Church differs in its way of life from temporal kingdoms. Following Aquinas, Suárez first affirms that the new law is chiefly an interior law consisting in the influx of grace and charity into the hearts of believers, the "law of the spirit of life."[72] Likewise, following Aquinas, Suárez second holds that the new law is also a tangible sign of Christ's will, but he adds that this tangible sign is first verbal and only subsequently preserved in memory or in writing.[73] Suárez calls these two aspects of the law the "impelling" (*impellens*) and the "commanding" (*imperans*), respectively; the latter relays the will of Christ, and the former helps the Christian to fulfill it.[74] The law *impellens* clearly differs from anything available in the temporal order, since it is the Holy Spirit interiorly inclining the subject to fulfill with pleasure (*suaviter*) what has been commanded.[75] Yet for Suárez, the law *imperans* also diverges significantly from laws given by civil authorities because the law *imperans* is first a verbal law inscribed interiorly on the intellect and will by a supernatural gift. Suárez explains that Christ wrote no book, but instead promulgated his commands orally.[76] These commands were subsequently received into the memory of the faithful and preserved "through the special grace and providence of the Holy Spirit." While such commands are properly said to be inscribed on the intellect, nevertheless they are also inscribed in the will *as commands* and not just as an impulse. Suárez explains, "For just as the lover is said to be in the beloved, and the beloved in the lover, so too whoever loves the law is rightly said to have it impressed on his heart, as God is said to be within the

Catholic Church, ed. Karl Rahner, S.J.; trans. Geoffrey Stevens (New York: The Mercier Press, 1967), 211–20.

[72] *De legibus* 10.3.2 (*Op.* 6, 562B): *Quia ergo gratia et charitas cordi infunditur, ideo simpliciter lex gratiae dicitur infundi in cordibus absolute et simpliciter*; *De legibus* 10.3.3 (*Op.* 6, 563A): *lex impulsus divini Spiritus perfectior est, ideo ab illa solet simpliciter denominari lex fidei, et lex spiritus vitae*. See Thomas Aquinas, *ST* I–II, q. 106, a. 1, corpus.

[73] *De legibus* 10.3.4 (*Op.* 6, 563A): *. . . in signo aliquo sensibili voluntatis Christi, et sic posse dici legem vocalem, vel scriptam in charta, vel etiam scriptam in mente per memoriam, seu dictamen intellectus judicantis servanda esse talia praecepta*.

[74] *De legibus* 10.3.4 (*Op.* 6, 563A). Suárez notes in this passage that these are not two laws but two components of one and the same law: *Hae autem duae leges non tanquam duae omnino distinctae accipiendae sunt, sed ut conjunctae, et quasi componentes unam perfectam. . . . Debent ergo intelligi illae duae tanquam partes inter se unitae, et ad constituendam perfectam Christi legem ordinatae, seu in eadem radice connexae*.

[75] *De legibus* 10.3.4 (*Op.* 6, 563A). Suárez's personal experience receiving commands from superiors yet being quickened by grace to fulfill willingly such commands with ease may be reflected in this treatise on the new law. See *De religione*, preface (*Op.* 13, 1).

[76] In this Suárez accords with the teaching of the Council of Trent, session 4 (DH §1501), that Christ promulgated the "purity of the gospel" first "from his own mouth," (*Dominus noster Iesus Christus Dei filius proprio ore primum promulgavit*), though Suárez does not here invoke the council in his defense.

one who loves him."[77] Only after an interlude of time were the words of Christ finally recorded on paper (*charta*), and this, too, at the behest and ordination of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit thus governs each stage of ecclesial law: the promulgation and reception of commands and the inclination to fulfill them.[78] The Church's "own order" is the order of the Spirit.

Suárez's description of the Church's governing authority further manifests this order of the Spirit. Like every political body, the body of Christ requires not only a law—be it written or unwritten, exterior or interior—but also a "living law," or an authority invested with the power to interpret the law. The term *regula viva* or *regula animata* had been used throughout the tradition to describe a religious superior (in, for example, Aquinas),[79] the *princeps* of a political body (in, for example, Aegidius Romanus),[80] or some level of ecclesial authority.[81] In his *Defensio fidei*, Suárez applies this term to the Church herself, "who is the living rule through which the Holy Spirit speaks."[82] This became a popular way to speak about the authority of the Church, evidenced in other early modern theologians such as Gregory of Valencia (1550–1603, a student of Suárez), Thomas Southwell (1592–1637), and Francesco Amico (1578–1651). As Valencia eloquently puts it, Scripture only illumines the faithful when "it is placed upon the lampstand of the Church."[83] Suárez does not equate this living

[77] *De legibus* 10.3.8 (*Op.* 6, 564B): *Ergo oportuit ut [praecepta] per specialem Spiritus sancti gratiam et providentiam interius scriberentur. . . . Nam, licet huiusmodi praecepta proprie et formaliter videantur scribi in intellectu . . . nihilominus etiam in voluntate suo modo scriberentur, non solum quoad impulsum, qui est formaliter in voluntate, sed etiam quoad ipsa praecepta. . . . Nam sicut amans dicitur esse in amato, et e converso, ita qui amat legem recte dicitur habere illam impressam in corde suo, sicut etiam Deus ipse dicitur esse in amante ipsum.*

[78] See especially *Defensio fidei* 1.11.7 (*Op.* 24, 56A): *Docet ergo Spiritus Sanctus omnes ordinato modo, communem videlicet plebem per Doctores, ipsos autem Doctores per Concilia, et maxime per Vicarium Christi. Et in hoc etiam ordo, et modus servatur. Nam Spiritus Sanctus omnibus aliquo modo immediate praebet auxilium ad supernaturalem doctrinam recipiendam, vel tradendam, juxta uniuscujusque munus, seu necessitatem. Et ita omnes fideles juvat, et illuminat interius ad credendum ea, quae per suos praedicatores docet.*

[79] Thomas Aquinas, *Quaestiones quodlibetales* I, q. 9, a. 4, corpus. On this idea, see José Antonio Alcáin, *La tradición* (Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto, 1998), 187.

[80] Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies*, 134.

[81] See Antonio Vargas-Muchaca, "Escritura, tradición e iglesia como reglas de fe según Francisco Suárez," PhD diss., University of Granada, 1967, 103.

[82] *Defensio fidei* 1.23.6 (*Op.* 24, 113A): *. . . ipsa Ecclesia, quae est viva regula, per quam Spiritus Sanctus loquitur.*

[83] Gregory of Valencia, S.J., *Analysis fidei*, 98, 114: *[Scriptura] lucet enim & illuminat, sed super candelabrum Ecclesiae constituta.* Thomas Southwell, S.J., who directly attributes his position to Suárez in *Regula viva seu analysis fidei* (Antwerp: Meursius, 1638), 92; and Francesco Amico, S.J., *Cursus theologici*, vol. 4 (Antwerp: Lesteenius, 1650), 61.

rule strictly with the pope as some later theologians will do,[84] but identifies it with the whole Church because, while a pope can speak infallibly *ex cathedra*, when he does so, it is the "Church speaking through its head, [and] neither is the body separated from the head, nor the head from the body." Further, the Church can propose truths of the faith in other ways, such as a general council or the universal consensus of the Church, presuming such truths are approved by the pope.[85]

This "universal consensus" should not, however, be confused as a source of papal power, as the *pactum* of the political body is the source of political power in the head. Rather, the pontiff receives his authority immediately from God as head of the Church and not through the faithful; he receives his authority from the same source as the Church's law, the "most perfect king" and "lawgiver," the "most perfect pontiff and head of the Church," Jesus Christ.[86] As Christ sent his Spirit upon the apostles, that same Holy Spirit continues to guide, govern, and teach the Church immediately (*immediate*) through her pastors, doctors, councils, and especially through the pope.[87] This presence of the Spirit both in the Church's ministers and in her laity renders all the faithful "taught by God" in a very intimate way.[88]

This analysis of relevant sections of the *De legibus* and *Defensio* supports the minimalist reading of Suárez's definition of the Church suggested in section 1.2.1; namely, that the Church as a moral body reflects the temporal order in being constituted of human beings bound by some common purpose and ordered by some law and governing authority, even if the very purpose, law, and governance of the Church bespeak something very different from what unifies a *civitas*.[89] In other words, the Church is a community that is visible and *in the world*, but this community stands as both a sign and instantiation of the world to come, united and formed as it is by its share in the life of the Spirit. These two aspects, the Church's visible existence in the world and her divine life, cannot

[84] In an 1828 letter, the American bishop John England contests those who say that "the Pope is our *living rule of faith*," arguing instead that Catholics have a "living tribunal; a living judge, but that tribunal of judgment is the Church." *The Works of the Right Rev. John England*, vol. 1 (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1849), 322.

[85] *Defensio fidei* 1.23.7 (*Op.* 24, 113B): *nam cum Pontifex definit, Ecclesia per caput suum loquitur, neque corpus separatur a capite, nec caput a corpore. . . . Ecclesia etiam aliis modis potest veritates fidei proponere, approbante etiam Pontifice, ut per Concilia generalia, et per universalem consensionem Ecclesiae.*

[86] *De legibus* 10.1.4 (*Op.* 6, 551A): *Christus est perfectissimus rex; ergo est proprie legislator. . . . [Christus] fuit perfectissimus Pontifex, et caput Ecclesiae.*

[87] *Defensio fidei* 1.11.7 (*Op.* 24, 56A); 1.3.8–9 (*Op.* 24, 16A).

[88] *Defensio fidei* 1.11.7 (*Op.* 24, 56B): *omnes sunt docibiles Dei.*

[89] The only comparison Suárez is willing to make is with the natural law, which does not "absolutely" differ from the new law but differs in its "grade of perfection." *De legibus* 10.3.10 (*Op.* 6, 565B).

be separated from one another, but directly serve her primary purpose, which is the salvation of human beings. A key text in the *Defensio* reveals this soteriological imperative driving Suárez's definition of the Church. Suárez argues that the Church must be a visible, definite, and particular congregation because

> [i]t is necessary for us to seek a Church in which we may be justified, or in which we may place our trust, or in which to receive true sacraments fruitfully and persevere to the end and ultimately be saved. No one, however, can seek a Church in general or conceived in the abstract, since this seeking is not speculative but practical and necessary for the foremost operations of this life.[90]

Here Suárez draws on the Aristotelian distinction between speculative and practical wisdom, the latter of which deals with universals in order to make judgments about particulars. People must seek a Church in which to be saved, yet seeking requires deliberation and action, both of which fall under the domain of practical wisdom. Practical wisdom, however, requires a particular object "about which it is possible to deliberate."[91] Thus, according to Suárez, the Church must be a particular congregation of people and not merely an abstract idea. His concern is practical and pastoral, and this concern drives his definition of the Church.[92] This concern is manifest again in the *Defensio* when Suárez argues that the Protestants cannot claim unity among themselves because they are united only by a common reason for schism. This negative unity is not enough to form a political or mystical body since the Protestants collectively lack agreement "in one religion, that is, in one way of salvation and in one faith."[93] This statement

[90] *Defensio fidei* 1.8.3 (*Op.* 24, 38A): *. . . nobis necessarium est vel Ecclesiam quaerere, in qua justificari possimus, vel cui credamus, vel in qua vera sacramenta cum fructu recipere, et usque ad finem perservare, ac denique salvari. Nemo auten potest quaerere Ecclasiam in communi, seu in abstracto conceptam, quia haec non est inquisitio speculativa, sed practica, necessaria ad operationes praecipuas hujus vitae*. Suárez later points out that Protestants also maintain the necessary visibility of their congregations. See *Defensio* 1.8.7 (*Op. omnia* 24, 38B–39A): *Obviabunt tandem Protestantes, hoc modo etiam suam Ecclesiam esse sibi visibilem, quia suam congregationem, quam vident, credunt esse veram Ecclesiam. Respondemus imprimis, in hoc nullam nobis esse cum illis contentionem, quia nos nihil moramur, an eorum congregatio visibilis sit, necne*. Suárez does, however, criticize the Protestant use of the term "invisible church." This critique will be discussed in chapter 2.

[91] Aristotle, *Nichomachean Ethics*, trans. W. D. Ross, in *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, vol. 2, ed. Jonathan Barnes (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984), VI.7.1141b.

[92] At *De controversiis*, vol. 2, bk. 3, ch. 12, 71A, Bellarmine evidences a similar concern in his chapter on the Church's visibility. The Church must be concretely discernible for the sake of bishops (*Quomodo poterant regere Ecclesiam, quam non noverant?*) and for the sake of the faithful (*nam tenemur omnes sub periculo aeternae mortis verae Ecclesiae nos adjungere*).

[93] *Defensio fidei* 1.15.7–8 (*Op.* 24, 76A): *Oportet ergo ut rex loquatur de consensione in unam religionem, id est, in unam viam salutis, et in unam fidem.*

marks the degree to which Suárez joins the human and visible elements in the Church with the divine and spiritual. Like every moral body, the Church is a *via*, a way of life. Unlike the moral body of the temporal kingdom, however, the Church is a *via salutis*, the path to, and locus of, participation in the divine life. Yet the Church cannot be a *via salutis* unless she is visible and in the world because, as Suárez reminds his readers in the *De legibus*, what is given to creatures must be given in the mode of the creature.[94] The Church as existing in the order of the Spirit is identical to the Church as a moral body of concrete persons, for its participation in the order of the Spirit is the source of the Church's moral unity as a body, a unity summed up in the one word Suárez uses to describe the ecclesial "way of salvation": *religio*.

1.3. The Church as *Religio* in *De religione*

1.3.1. Introduction and Method

In the previous section, I argued that Suárez equates any "moral or political body" with a communal way of life, bound not primarily or even necessarily by temporal borders but by a common will and purpose. Thus, I suggested that to call the Church a moral body means nothing more than to call her a way of life governed by law and authority. In this section, we will move from examining the definition, law, and authority governing the Church to the manifestations of her way of life. We will move, as it were, from the bones to the flesh of the Church, recalling that these bones are not the dry bones (*ossa arida*) of Ezekiel's vision, but rather bones enlivened by the Spirit (Ezek. 37:1–5). We move in this section, then, to Suárez's understanding of the Church as *religio* in his monumental work *De virtute et statu religionis*, or *De religione*. As mentioned in the Introduction, this work represents Suárez's most comprehensive treatment of *religio*, a word that encompasses for him the prayers, feasts, vows, and states of life within the Church, in short, the ecclesial *lex orandi* and *lex vivendi*. As Suárez articulates it in the *Defensio* text previously cited, *religio* is the "way of salvation," a definition that recognizes the human (the Church as a *via*) and divine (the Church as infused with the saving Spirit of Christ) elements of the Church. As the way of salvation, the Church is the interpretive key to the *De virtute et statu religionis*; she is the nexus between *religio* as a virtue common to all and *religio* as a state of vowed religious life; she is the place where the virtue of religion is fully realized and in which the state of religion is conceived, formed, and nourished. To argue for this thesis, we will examine the most explicitly ecclesiological section of the

[94] *De legibus* 10.4.9 (*Op.* 6, 569B).

De religione. Throughout this examination, however, we must remember that the Church as *religio* is not an additional image parallel to the *congregatio* or *societas*. Rather, for Suárez, *religio* indicates more fully than these two terms *how* the Church is a new society or "way of life" containing human and divine elements; *religio* shows the bones of the Church clothed in sinews and flesh (Ezek. 37:8).

1.3.2. The Place of the Church in the *De religione*

Suárez describes his *De virtute et statu religionis* as a work of "practical" theology, that is, a work that deals not so much with our knowledge of God in himself as with our actions of veneration and worship due to God. Indeed, sacred theology remains incomplete if it stops at speculation and fails to show the "way and manner" in which humans ought to honor God.[95] Having undertaken this work at the command of his superiors, Suárez nevertheless embraces the task willingly, since "this was always the goal of my labors, that God may be both better known by men, and more ardently and holily worshipped."[96] This worship due to God Suárez calls *religio* according to the classical designation.[97] Yet, for Christians, *religio* has two possible meanings according to Suárez: one that expresses some virtue common to all Christians, another that signifies the particular state of those commonly called "religious" who devote themselves in a special way to the worship of God.[98] Suárez proposes to treat both meanings of *religio*, as the name of the work suggests, since the two are "joined by a mutual bond (*mutuo nexu*)" insofar as the virtue of religion is the efficient and final cause, the beginning and end, of the state of religion. Any mention of the Church is conspicuously absent in this preface.

The Church as *religio* first appears two chapters later, when Suárez discusses variant uses of the word *religio.* The primary understanding of religion is that of a

[95] *De religione*, preface (*Op.* 13, 1): *Sacra Theologia ita subtili divinarum rerum speculatione detinetur, ut humanas etiam dirigat actiones, speculatrix enim est et practica. Hinc fit ut, cum Deum tanquam objectum contempletur, non solum ejus nobis ingerat cognitionem, sed etiam modum ostendat quo cognitum debito Majestati cultu veneremur. Minus quidem laudabilis esset Theologia, si mentem illustraret, non mores dirigeret, si Divinae Majestatis notitiam conferret, neque ad eam colendam, viam modumque ostenderet*. Suárez goes on to cite Romans 1 to support this argument, alluding to Romans 1:21.

[96] *De religione*, preface (*Op. omnia* 13, 1): *Cum enim hic semper fuerit meorum laborum scopus, ut Deus ab hominibus et cognoscatur magis, et ardentius sanctiusque colatur.*

[97] See most famously Cicero, *De inventione*, trans. H. M. Hubbell, LCL 268 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949), bk. 2, no. 53, 328–29. Suárez relays Cicero's understanding in *De religione* tract. 1, bk. 1, ch. 1, no. 1 [hereafter *De religione* 1.1.1.1] (*Op.* 13, 3B–4A).

[98] *De religione*, preface (*Op.* 13, 2): *Sed quia duos hoc nomen religio praecipuos habet significatus; alterum, quo exprimit virtutem quamdam omnibus Christianis communem, alterum, quo peculiarem significat statum eorum qui proprie religiosi appellantur.*

virtue or affect inclining a person to some good. Suárez however adds that "the term 'religion' is typically attributed not only to internal affect, but also to exterior actions and, indeed, even to the things with which God is worshipped and also to the doctrine which teaches such cult or ceremony."[99] Michael J. Buckley dubiously marks this Suárezian understanding of *religio* as a departure from the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, for whom *religio* was a moral virtue that, according to Buckley, did not include the external rituals or *doctrina* associated with religion. Buckley thus concludes that Suárez straddles the line between the classical understanding of *religio* and modern, anthropological understandings that see religion as a collection of beliefs and cultic practices.[100] Yet, while Aquinas certainly considers the external acts of religion to be secondary (*quasi secundarios*) to the internal acts, a teaching Suárez faithfully follows, he nevertheless sees an integral relationship between the two since for human beings, invisible things can be ascertained only through the visible (Rom. 1:20).[101] In precisely this way Suárez will describe the relationship between external acts and the internal affect of *religio* a few chapters later. Invoking the "twofold nature" of human beings, Suárez writes that "just as a human being understands spiritual things through the sensible . . . so too he can hardly express interior reverence and submission except by exhibiting some sensible signs of it, through which signs he satisfies his interior affect and is confirmed and grows in that interior affect."[102] Suárez adds that humans bodily express interior affect not only because

[99] *De religione* 1.1.2.5 (*Op.* 13, 8A): *Advertere oportet nomen religionis non solum interno affectui, sed etiam exterioribus actionibus, imo et rebus quibus Deus colitur, tribui solere, atque etiam doctrinae quae talem cultum vel caeremoniam docet.*

[100] Michael J. Buckley, S.J., "The Study of Religion and the Rise of Atheism: Conflict or Confirmation?," in *Fields of Faith: Theology and Religious Studies for the Twenty-first Century*, ed. David F. Ford et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 8–9. Ernst Feil likewise sees Suárez as someone who "seems to have sensed the limits of this [medieval] tradition" but, unlike Buckley, Feil thinks that Suárez remains sufficiently embedded in the medieval tradition such that his "concept of *religio* as a virtue has nothing to do with the post-Enlightenment understanding of it." See his "From the Classical *Religio* to the Modern *Religion:* Elements of a Transformation between 1550 and 1650," in *Religion in History: The Word, the Idea, the Reality*, ed. Michel Despland and Gérard Vallée (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1992), 35. See also Feil, *Religio: Zweiter Band; Die Geschichte eines neuzeitlichen Grundbegriffs zwischen Reformation und Rationalismus (ca. 1540–1620)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 130–48. Aaron Pidel, S.J., helpfully corrects aspects of Feil's analysis in "Francisco Suárez on Religion and Religious Pluralism," in *Francisco Suárez: Jesuits and the Complexities of Modernity*, ed. Robert Aleksander Markys and Juan Antonio Senent de Frutos (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 128–153. See also Giorgio Agamben's placement of Suárez between Aquinas and Kant in *Opus Dei: An Archaeology of Duty*, trans. Adam Kotsko (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013), 104–14.

[101] *ST* II-II, q. 81, a. 7, *corpus.* See also *Super Boetium de trinitate* par. 2, q. 2, a. 3, co.

[102] *De religione* 2.1.1.9 (*Op.* 13, 80B): *Quia sicut intelligit spiritualia per sensibilia, et ad modum rerum corporalium, ita vix exprimit interiorem reverentiam et submissionem, nisi exhibendo aliqua sensibilia signa illius, per quae et suo affectui quodammodo satisfacit, et rursus per eadem in illo interiori*

of their hylomorphic nature, but also because of their social nature, which drives humans to make manifest their interior, religious affects.[103] Religion is never a merely private affair. While Suárez grounds this twofold argument (the hylomorphic and the social) in the natural law, he nevertheless points out that it is in the Church that the relationship between internal and external finds clearest expression, and "this is no surprise, because God having been made flesh is adored with corporeal members, with bended knee and hands outstretched."[104] Here Suárez artfully weaves together both the hylomorphic and the social arguments by rooting them in the incarnate person of Christ whom the Church communally worships. This incarnate, hylomorphic, and social understanding of *religio* will be crucial for the discussion of ecclesial unity in chapter 2. For now, it is important to see how not only the natural law but the Church justifies Suárez's inclusion of external actions in his definition of *religio*.

If we return to the beginning chapters of the *De virtute religionis*, we find a similar ecclesiological argument for the inclusion of *doctrina* in religion. As he moves from the first definition of *religio* as a virtue to its second definition as a state, Suárez remarks that this latter definition admits further differentiation, "for the general state of the Catholic Church, which professes a doctrine and a manner of worshipping God, is called Christian religion, and can even be called the unique and sole religion, since outside of the Church no true religion can exist."[105] Suárez presents the Church as a "state" that professes and performs the true worship of God. Such true worship depends upon both a speculative knowledge of the true God (*doctrina*) and a practical knowledge of the proper way to

affectu confirmatur et crescit. At *De religione* 7.1.5.11 (*Op.* 15, 30A), Suárez employs a similar argument when he defends the need for those in the state of religion to exhibit such a state by means of external actions: *licet perfectio hominis interior praecipue et essentialiter in donis et actibus internis posita sit . . . nihilominus ab homine absque actibus externis, vel sine ablatione externorum impedimentorum, non potest moraliter et humano modo comparari*.

[103] *De religione* 2.1.1.9 (*Op.* 13, 80B): *Praeterquam quod, cum homo non sit solitarium animal, sed sociale, et inter homines vivat, expedit ut existimationem quam de Deo habet, et adorationem quam illi praebet, aliis ostendat; hoc autem non fit nisi per corporalem adorationem, quia homines non vident internos actus nostros, sed sensibiles*. Compare Suárez's discussion here with that of the Church of England's Lancelot Andrewes in *Selected Sermons & Lectures*, ed. Peter McCullough (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 22, who likewise emphasizes the importance of bodily prayer but does not employ the natural hylomorphic or social arguments to the extent that Suárez does.

[104] *De religione* 2.1.1.9 (*Op.* 13, 80B): *Hoc etiam suadet vetustissima consuetudo, non solum Ecclesiae in lege gratiae (de quo mirum non est, quod Deum, factum carnem, ipsis etiam corporeis membris, et genibus flexis, et manibus extensis adoret), verum etiam omnium fidelium Sanctorum, tam in lege veteri, quam naturali*.

[105] *De religione* 1.1.2.6 (*Op.* 13, 8B): *Nam generalis status Ecclesiae Catholicae, quae talem doctrinam, talemque modum colendi Deum profitetur, religio Christiana dicitur, imo et unica et sola religio dici potest, quia extra illam nulla esse potest vera religio*.

honor God (*modus colendi*), both of which constitute Christian religion (*religio Christiana*), and both of which are found within the Church. Earlier in this chapter Suárez argues that the speculative and practical knowledge integral to true religion can be found only in Christian faith, which is "simultaneously and eminently speculative and practical: speculative in that it reveals God to be, and to be worthy of all honor; practical insofar as it teaches the manner and obligation of worshipping him."[106] An error on either point results in false religion. For example, the ancient Gentiles lacked a speculative knowledge of the true God and thus fell into polytheistic worship. Jews, heretics, and some nonbelievers acknowledge the one, true God and creator, yet they worship him with false or superfluous signs.[107] All such groups, then, lack true religion because they do not hold the true Christian faith. Suárez thus demonstrates the integral relationship, within *religio*, between internal affect, external acts, and doctrine, rooting his argument not only in the natural law but preeminently in the Church as *via salutis*. Suárez distinguishes the virtue of faith from that of religion,[108] but he also affirms the Church Fathers' practice of calling Christian faith the "sole and true religion, because faith contains the truth in revealing the God who is to be worshipped and in setting forth the manner in which he is to be worshipped."[109] Further, since the definition of the Church is a congregation of those professing true faith, Suárez is able to recognize the Church as the home of true religion, since "true religion is grounded in true faith."[110] Therefore, the Church as religion is a specification of the Church as a body of people mystically and morally united by faith, as religion reveals the principal purpose of this mystical body, namely, to offer worship to God.[111]

The Church as a "state," however, Suárez differentiates from that special mode of living in which some faithful are congregated for the sake of worshipping God

[106] *De religione* 1.1.2.2 (*Op.* 13, 7A): *Est enim fides simul et eminenter speculativa et practica: speculativa quidem, ostendens Deum esse, et dignus esse omni honore; practica vero, quatenus etiam docet modum et obligationem colendi illum.*

[107] *De religione* 1.1.2.3 (*Op.* 13, 7A–B). Suárez admits that the false worship of the Jews, heretics, and some infidels is accompanied by something amiss in their speculative conception of God: *in his omnibus nunquam deest aliquis error circa ipsius Dei cognitionem.*

[108] See *De religione* 1.3.2.3 (*Op.* 13, 40A–B). This is presumably what Feil is highlighting when he overstates that for Suárez, religion "has no link with the theological virtues of faith, hope, and love." See Feil, "From the Classical *Religio* to the Modern *Religion*," 35.

[109] *De religione* 1.1.2.2 (*Op.* 13, 7A): *Atque hoc modo fides christiana solet frequenter a Patribus appellari sola et vera religio, quia veritatem continet in ostendo Deo, qui colendus est, et in proponendo modo quo colendus est.*

[110] *De religione* 1.1.2.4 (*Op.* 13, 7B): *Erit ergo vera religio quae in vera fide fundatur.*

[111] The assignment of *religio* to the supernatural reality of the Church does not exclude the possibility of *religio* as a natural virtue for Suárez, or a virtue manifest imperfectly in other groups such as the Jews. See Pidel, "Francisco Suárez on Religion and Religious Pluralism."

in a more perfect way, what we today would call the state of religious life.[112] Since the state of religious life consists of *fideles* and exists for the sake of true worship, it cannot be divorced from the Church but persists as a state of life *within* the ecclesial state of life.[113] For Suárez, then, the Church is a "state" in which the virtue of religion finds truest expression and out of which the vowed religious state arises. In a sense, the Church is the very bond (*nexus*) that joins the virtue and state of religion to each other. This conclusion is supported by the location of Suárez's most explicit ecclesiological section in the *De religione*, right after his treatise on the virtue of religion (*De virtute religionis*) and in the opening pages of his treatise on the state of religion (*De statu religionis*). After examining the virtue of religion in the first half of the *De religione*,[114] Suárez begins the second half with an excursus on the Church,[115] which he deems necessary in order to ground his disquisition on the religious state. The ecclesiology of the *De religione* thus constitutes quite literally the nexus of the entire work. The Church, then, is an interpretive key for understanding Suárez's *De religione* and, conversely, the *De religione* elucidates Suárez's teaching on the Church.

1.3.3. The Church as the State of the Spiritual Life

Suárez's most explicit ecclesiological sections of the *De religione* appear in the first two chapters of the *De statu religionis* on "What Is the State of the Christian Life?" and "Whether the State of Christian Life Can Fittingly Be Divided into the State of Common Life and the State of Perfection?" Suárez first sets out to define what he means by a "state." The word *status* conveys manifold meanings, but when it is applied to persons, it always indicates two things: perfection in some condition or mode of living, and quiet or immutability therein.[116] By "perfection" Suárez simply means "completion in its own kind," akin to the full actualization of a potency or to the "perfect" community discussed in the *De legibus*.[117]

[112] *De religione* 1.1.2.6 (*Op.* 13, 8B): *specialiori autem modo religionis vox applicata est ad significandum peculiarem vivendi modum et statum, in quo aliqui fideles congregantur ad perfectiori modo colendum Deum.*

[113] In the preface to book one of *De statu perfectionis et religionis*, Suárez places the state of religion squarely *in Ecclesia*. He further explains the relationship between the Church and religious state in *De religione* 7.1.2.9 (*Op.* 15, 11A).

[114] *Op.* 13 and 14.

[115] *Op.* 15, 2A–13A.

[116] *De religione* 7.1.1.1 (*Op.* 15, 2B): *. . . cum vero [nomen status] personae attribuitur, duo semper indicat, scilicet, perfectionem in aliqua conditione, vel modo existendi ejus, et quietem seu immutabilitatem in illa.*

[117] *De religione* 7.1.1.1 (*Op.* 15, 2B): *. . . statum significare aliquam conditionem perfectam, et quasi consummatam in suo genere . . . in suo ordine, seu oppositam inchoationi rei, quasi in fieri existentis.* Suárez

By "quiet or immutability" Suárez does not mean an absolute stasis but a *moral* stability "like a habit, which changes only with difficulty because it is made firm either by custom or law or some similar manner."[118] Suárez reminds his reader that a "similar manner" cannot include the mere lack of an obligation. The absence of marriage, for example, does not place one in a "state" of consecrated virginity.[119] Nor, however, does every obligation of itself constitute a state.[120] Rather, following Aquinas, Suárez argues that a state properly speaking arises from a "perduring cause" (*causam permanentem*),[121] though such causes vary depending on the state under consideration. In every case, states bear reference to an obligation or lack thereof.[122] For example, Suárez reduces all human states to either a state of servitude or a state of freedom. In the case of the former, the perduring cause is the just title of dominion that a master bears over his servants and that gives birth to certain obligations. In the case of the latter, however, the perduring cause arises from the natural law, "since man is naturally created free," and lacks the obligation of earthly servitude or even the obligation of remaining free. Indeed, a free person can give up his freedom with just cause.[123]

The state of freedom does not, however, lack all obligation whatsoever. Suárez develops this idea by juxtaposing the states of bondage and freedom with the states of sin and grace. A state of sin, Suárez writes, is properly a state of bondage because it "has a consummation in its own order" (even if only perceived in light of the good) and because "sin inhering [in sinners] drags [them] by its own weight into further sin" (*peccatum inhaerens suo pondere in aliud trahit*) and thus is difficult to alter—indeed, to leave such a state is beyond the natural powers of man.[124] The state of grace, on the other hand, is a state of freedom so long as "freedom" is properly understood. Cajetan had argued that the graced state is free because it is unbound by the servitude and punishment of sin. Suárez concurs, but thinks that we must go further because grace not only frees us from

invokes the philosophers, doctors, and jurists to defend "perfection" as a quality of a state. Legal theory, for example, refers to a man reaching a state when he comes of age.

[118] *De religione* 7.1.1.4 (*Op.* 15, 3B): *Unde statum dicunt esse veluti habitum, qui est difficile mobilis, quia est vel consuetudine, vel lege, vel alio modo simili firmatus*. Suárez here is stating what he takes to be the common opinion of the Latins (*Latinorum*), which he goes on to affirm.

[119] *De religione* 7.1.1.8 (*Op.* 15, 4B).

[120] *De religione* 7.1.1.8 (*Op.* 15, 4B): *Imo neque omnis obligatio sufficiet constituere statum, nisi causam habet permanentem.*

[121] *De religione* 7.1.1.8 (*Op.* 15, 4B).

[122] *De religione* 7.1.1.9-10 (*Op.* 15, 4B–5A); 7.1.1.8 (*Op.* 15, 4B): *Itaque verum quidem est, in omni statu includi respectum ad obligationem, quasi sub disjunctione habendi vel carendi illa.*

[123] *De religione* 7.1.1.10 (*Op.* 15, 5A). In both cases the state is alterable; the slave can be set free, and the free person can lose his liberty either by his own will or as a result of a just punishment. Yet, both conditions possess sufficient moral stability to be "states."

[124] *De religione* 7.1.1.11 (*Op.* 15, 5B).

sin but confers a positive obligation. Paradoxically, then, the graced state is free first and foremost because it is a "state of servitude to God" and bears with it the obligation of serving and loving God. Even freedom must be bound. Yet within such servitude, Suárez argues, is true and perfect liberty because this servitude makes us friends of God.[125] As in his *De legibus* discussion of the *societas*, Suárez sees no conflict between a freely lived state of life and the bonds of obligation. Indeed, it is such bonds that can ensure the freedom and flourishment sought in a moral state.

This relationship between the *status* and the *societas* is brought to the fore when Suárez turns to the second part of his initial question: what is the state *of the Christian life*? Suárez articulates that the Church embraces many and various states of life, but not all of them are ordered properly to the Christian life, that is, to the pursuit of eternal life.[126] Suárez nowhere argues for the congruence between a state of Christian life and the Church. Instead he presumes that any "state of Christian life" must make its home within the Church. We can express Suárez's position with increased inclusivity by saying that wherever the Christian life is lived, there, too, is the Church.[127] Yet what is a state of Christian life? A state of Christian life is ordered in a particular way to eternal life, yet not everything in the Church is immediately ordered to beatitude. Thus, Suárez writes, we must differentiate what the Church has in common with other, non-Christian commonwealths (*respublica*) from what uniquely pertains to the Church.[128] Like every political body, the Church is ordered to the conservation, propagation, and temporal peace and utility of the present life, and within her exist all kinds of persons from the very same states that constitute civil life—free and servile, noble and common, wed and unwed.[129] Here Suárez assumes and does not argue that the Church can be compared to a civil *respublica*, thus supporting the minimalist and non-controversialist reading of his ecclesial definition. Yet, he adds something further that is only implied in other texts, namely, that the Church is ordered to a supernatural end that does not exclude the natural ends

[125] *De religione* 7.1.1.12 (*Op.* 15, 5B): *Addere vero possumus [Cajetani], principaliter [status gratiae] esse statum servitutis Dei, quae est vera libertas, juxta illud ad Rom. 6. . . . Est autem illa servitus, non vilis, sed nobilissima, quia perfecit libertatem hominis. . . . Unde non ita est status libertatis, ut solum dicat carentiam obligationis, sed potius ut magnam obligationem importet serviendi Deo, amandi ipsum, et permanendi in tali statu.*

[126] *De religione* 7.1.1.15 (*Op.* 15, 6B): *sunt enim in Ecclesia varii modi statuum; non tamen omnes ad vitam christianam, ut christiana est, ordinantur; ideoque particulam illam formaliter sumimus, quia de solo illo statu, qui peculiari modo ad vitam aeternam consequendam ordinatur, tractamus.*

[127] This inclusive expression of Suárez's point will be further proven in chapter 2.

[128] *De religione* 7.1.1.15 (*Op.* 15, 6B).

[129] *De relgione* 7.1.1.15 (*Op.* 15, 6B–7A): *[Ecclesia] ordinatur ad praesentis vitae conservationem, propagationem, et temporalem pacem et commoditatem.*

of earthly conservation, propagation, peace, and utility. Like grace perfecting nature, the Church draws to herself elements of the temporal order. Yet we cannot presume that such elements carry univocal meanings in both the civil and ecclesial orders; our exposition of the *lex nova* of the Church forbids us from jumping to such conclusions. We will explore this situation in what follows.

Suárez continues that the Church can be considered in another way insofar as she is "a congregation of humans tending toward supernatural beatitude through faith and works" and as such she can be called "the state of the Christian, or spiritual, life."[130] Suárez nowhere suggests two distinct ends (*finis*) of the Church—the one natural, the other supernatural—but only two aspects of ecclesial life that remain deeply intertwined, since the spiritual state depends, to some degree, on temporal states of life.[131] The integration is so profound that Suárez will also use the terms *material* and *formal* respectively to describe the temporal and spiritual aspects of the Church, the same hylomorphic language he uses in his much earlier *De Ecclesia*.[132] Within the formal aspect Suárez distinguishes two spiritual states: the state of the end and the state of the way. The Church triumphant enjoys the former state since she possesses the fullness of perfection and stability. To it the name *status* properly belongs "as if through antonomasia." All other states pale in comparison to that of the blessed.[133] The Church militant inhabits the "state of the way" since she has not yet reached the end pursued. Though transitory, the Church militant can yet be called a *status* because such a state is "a personal condition or manner of living apt for tending into beatitude."[134] Note that Suárez here uses the exact language employed in the *De legibus* to describe a religious congregation: the Church is bound by a common way of life, not by earthly borders.

[130] *De religione* 7.1.1.16 (*Op.* 15, 7A): *Alio ergo modo consideratur Ecclesia, ut est congregatio hominum per fidem et opera tendentium in supernaturalem beatitudinem; et sic ipsamet Ecclesia est status vitae christianae, seu spiritualis.*

[131] *De religione* 7.1.1.15 (*Op.* 15, 7A): *. . . ex illis statibus aliquo modo pendet proprius spiritualis status.*

[132] The material/formal language appears in *De religione* 7.1.2.2 (*Op.* 15, 8B) but with clear reference to 7.1.1.15–16: *Nunc ergo solum advertimus iterum, quod supra dictum est, posse Christi Ecclesiam dupliciter spectari, videlicet, materialiter (ut sic dicam), id est, quatenus est quaedam hominum congregatio, in qua sunt plura temporalia regna ad naturalem finem et commoditatem ordinata; vel formaliter, id est, quatenus est quaedam spiritualis et supernaturalis respublica, et unum mysticum corpus, fide, ejusque professione, ac sacramentis unitum sub uno capite Christo, ejusque Vicario, ad aeternam felicitatem per media congruentia tendens.*

[133] *De religione* 7.1.1.16 (*Op.* 15, 7A): *Verumtamen priori termino, scilicet, beatitudinis, nomen status vitae christianae merito tribuitur, nam in illo perfectissime inveniuntur illae duae conditiones perfectionis et stabilitatis; et ideo ille solus quasi per antonomasiam nomen status meretur.*

[134] *De religione* 7.1.1.17 (*Op.* 15, 7B): *conditio personae, vel modus vivendi aptus ad tendendum in beatitudinem.*

Suárez elaborates that the ecclesial *status viae* fulfills the two conditions of a state (perfection and stability) because "in this mode of living is found true rectitude and all perfection necessary for the salvation of one's soul."[135] In other words, the pilgrim Church possesses perfection by possessing all necessary means of grace to fulfill her end, namely, salvation. The Church possesses stability and firmness "first in the community of the Church of Christ." Christ is the steadfast rock upon which the Church is founded, and in him all the faithful enjoy a fellowship against which the gates of hell cannot prevail. Second, the Church possesses stability in each person, who through baptism receives the obligation of remaining in the Church and through faith receives divine help to fulfill that obligation.[136] Suárez here locates the firmness of the Church as a state principally in Christ and in his *community*, not in each individual. As in his other works, so too here, Suárez does not define the Church as a mere aggregate of individuals but as a fellowship of persons joined to Christ.[137] The community receives pride of place in Suárez's theology of the Mystical Body, though never at the expense of the individual. Rather, the individual can be understood only in relation to the community.[138]

Suárez roots the firmness of the Church as state secondarily in each person who receives baptism and therein a permanent cause and obligation to remain in the Church. Though Suárez elsewhere clearly differentiates baptism from a religious vow,[139] in this passage some semblance between the two surfaces when

[135] *De religione* 7.1.1.18 (*Op.* 15, 8A): *Aliunde vero, in hoc vivendi modo, vera rectitudo et tota perfectio ad salutem animae necessaria invenitur*.

[136] *De religione* 7.1.1.18 (*Op.* 15, 8A): *Quia imprimis in illo magna stabilitas et firmitas invenitur: primo quidem in communitate Ecclesiae Christi, quia in ipso, tanquam in firmissima petra, fundata est principaliter, et ex promissione ac potentia ejus, ita stabilita est ut portae inferi contra eam praevelere non possint. Deinde etiam in singulis personis hunc statum profitentibus, habet causam permanentem de se ac stabilem. Quia fundatur imprimis in professione fidei facta in Baptismo, quae de se obligat ad permanendum semper in tali genere vitae ad salutem animae pertinentis, et in vera Christi fide. Deinde fides ipsa habet firmissima fundamenta, et impetrare potest vires et auxilia ad perseverandum in Christi Ecclesia*.

[137] Suárez thus avoids what Benoît-Dominique de la Soujeole, *Introduction to the Mystery of the Church*, trans. Michael J. Miller (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2014), 112, considers a pitfall in the early modern ecclesiology of the French School, namely, a theology of the mystical body "from a perspective that was primarily individual."

[138] Compare *De religione* 2.1.1.9 (*Op.* 13, 80B): *homo non sit solitarium animal, sed sociale, et inter homines vivat*. It is helpful here to remember Aristotle's definition of a human being as a "political animal" and the Philosopher's consequent claim that the self-sufficient person who is no part of a city "must be either a beast or a god" (Aristotle, *Politics*, trans. Benjamin Jowett, in *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, vol. 2, ed. Jonathan Barnes (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984), I.1253a.

[139] See *De religione* 7.3.2.6 (*Op.* 14, 894A). Note here that Suárez is distinguishing between a vow and baptism in order to defend the Church's teaching that no one can profess a vow before the age of reason (unlike baptism, which infants can receive).

he describes baptism as the initial, obligating act uniting a person with the ecclesial community. In the next chapter of the *De statu religionis*, Suárez even relates baptism to a religious vow as the two bonds constituting the twofold perfection of the Christian life—the former essential, the latter an additional obligation for those specially called.[140] The Church does not only oblige, however, but offers the faith and grace as means that permit someone to fulfill the obligation of remaining in the ecclesial state. Such faith and grace render the fallen state a state of life rather than death—indeed, a "state of life of the faithful, or the state of one ordered to the next life."[141] This state of life can be divided into the state of the natural law, the state of the old law, and the "state of the Church of Christ," which phrase Suárez uses here instead of the "state of the new law," which would more appropriately fit the sequence. This third state is properly called the state of the Christian life, because it is "a kind of religion (*modus religionis*) necessary for salvation and eternal life and ordered through sufficient means. This mode of living is discovered in the sole Church of Christ and is established in the faith of Christ."[142] For Suárez, then, the Church is the primary "religious life" (*religio*), a way of living that has stability and perfection and gives birth to all other forms of ecclesial and religious life.

1.3.4. Diverse Manifestations of Ecclesial Life: Ignatian, Pauline, and Dionysian Dimensions of Ecclesiology

While Suárez asserts in the *De legibus* that the Church must possess a uniformity in faith and exterior religion, he nevertheless recognizes in the *De statu religionis* a diversity of states within that one *religio*.[143] Some states belong to the Church only materially. These are states of life that the Church shares with the temporal commonwealth; again, states of freedom and servility, the noble and the commoner, the married and the unwed. These states belong to the Church because *people* belong to the Church. The "material" of the Church, according to Suárez's *De Ecclesia*, is "human pilgrims," and it is within these human pilgrims that the state of the Church resides as a "personal condition."[144] Since Christian persons enjoy a dual citizenship, in the Church and the world, the states of life which they inhabit *in terra* are embraced *in Ecclesia.* These states do not belong "formally"

[140] *De religione* 7.1.2.8–9 (*Op.* 15, 10B–11A).

[141] *De religione* 7.1.1.18 (*Op.* 15, 7B): *[Status naturae lapsae] . . . revera est status vitae fidelis, seu status ordinati ad vitam consequendam.*

[142] *De religione* 7.1.1.18 (*Op.* 15, 7B–8A).

[143] *De legibus* 10.6.8 (*Op.* 6, 582A): *haec Ecclesia semper debet esse una, et ideo observare etiam debet uniformitatem, non solum in fide, sed etiam in religione exterior*.

[144] *De religione* 7.1.1.17 (*Op.* 15, 7B).

to the Church because they do not directly pertain to her form, that is, to supernatural faith tending toward beatitude. But persons inhabiting these states can still be elevated by grace to the perfection of charity, and their material state can thereby have a role to play in their sanctification.[145] Suárez intends to point out only that such personal conditions do not belong *properly* to the Church because *of themselves* they are not ordered to spiritual salvation.[146] The only possible exception, Suárez admits, is the state of marriage. Unlike Aquinas, Suárez feels the need to ask whether marriage belongs formally to the Church.[147] He admits that there is nothing particularly spiritual in marriage *per se* since it is common to every temporal commonwealth. Nevertheless, Suárez does acknowledge that sacramentality gives marriage a particular firmness and indissolubility beyond the merely human bond and confers spiritual grace to spouses for eternal life.[148] More than that, however, Suárez admits the importance of marriage for the Church, since "the duty (*officium*) of marriage is a quasi-foundation necessary for the conservation and perpetuity of the Church, and thus in it is found a special necessity for divine aid."[149] Because the Church is integrally bound to persons, the Church is also integrally bound to the state of marriage not only as a means of temporal perpetuity but as a conduit of grace for spouses. Though Suárez falls short of calling marriage a "special" state of Christian life like that of a vowed religious, he nevertheless recognizes that marriage cannot be relegated only to the temporal and material order of the Church, at most calling it only "quasi-material."[150] For Suárez, then, marriage is a bridge between the Church and the world.[151]

[145] *De religione* 7.1.5.1 (*Op.* 15, 27B): *Multi seculares et conjugati possunt esse perfecti, et tamen non sunt in statu perfectionis.*

[146] *De religione* 7.1.2.2 (*Op.* 15, 8B): *quia per se non ad spiritualem salutem vel finem, sed ad temporalem ordinatur.*

[147] *De religione* 7.1.2.14 (*Op.* 15, 12B): *Et ideo D. Thomas, tractando de statibus Ecclesiae, ut talis est, nullam mentionem status matrimonii fecit.* See Aquinas, *ST* II–II, q. 183.

[148] *De religione* 7.1.2.2 (*Op.* 15, 8B): *Quia vero in eo nihil spirituale invenitur, praeter peculiarem firmitatem et indissolubilitatem, quam sacramentum addit humano vinculo, et spiritualem gratiam et auxilia quae conjugibus confert, ut convenienter ad vitam aeternam illo munere utantur, ideo specialis ejus consideratio ad tractatum de sacramentis pertinet.*

[149] *De religione* 7.1.2.2 (*Op.* 15, 8B–9A): *Praesertim quia, simpliciter loquendo, in ordine ad vitam aeternam non excedit communem statum vitae christianae; sed quia officium ejus est quasi fundamentum necessarium ad Ecclesiae conservationem et perpetuitatem, et peculiaris necessitas divini auxilii in eo invenitur, ideo per quoddam sacramentum illi peculiariter provisum est.*

[150] *De religione* 7.1.2.14 (*Op.* 15, 12B).

[151] In his *The Christian State of Life*, trans. Mary Frances McCarthy (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1983), 240, Hans Urs von Balthasar writes that "Suarez, under the influence of the aforementioned Scholasticism, does not see to what an extent the sacrament of matrimony is the basis not only of a civil, but also of a Christian state." While Balthasar correctly assesses that for Suárez, marriage is not a special state of Christian life, his analysis nevertheless fails to acknowledge the

In addition to the states that belong to the Church materially (and quasi-materially), Suárez also delineates states of life that belong to the Church formally, that is, those states that pertain to the Church insofar as she is a spiritual and supernatural commonwealth and mystical body.[152] Suárez subdivides the formal states of the Church into those ordered toward the common good and spiritual rule of the Church and those ordered to the spiritual good of individuals.[153] In the former category Suárez places clerics and the laity; in the latter, religious and those consecrated to virginity and works of mercy.[154] Clerics—properly, those who have received the sacrament of Holy Orders—devote themselves to the spiritual ministries of the Church through a special consecration. The laity, Suárez writes, are all those who are not clerics, and thus the lay state is distinguished from the clerical state only by negation (*per negationem*). The phrasing here is crucial: the lay state is *distinguished* by negation, not *defined* by it.[155] Rather, the laity "profess the state of Christian life," according to Suárez, or a "stable and firm *ratio* of living ordained and instituted for a salvation of grace in this life and of glory in the next."[156] As already indicated, such a state receives its permanence through baptism and the profession of faith that "subject the person to the Church such that he cannot easily be severed from her." Such a state further enables the baptized to grow in

ways in which Suárez sees marriage as a "quasi-foundation" of the Church, and thus of the Christian life. In this aspect of Suárez's thought, he subtly stretches beyond that "influence of the aforementioned Scholasticism."

[152] *De religione* 7.1.2.2 (*Op.* 15, 8B): *advertimus . . . posse Ecclesiam Christi . . . spectari . . . formaliter, id est, quatenus est quaedam spiritualis et supernaturalis respublica, et unum mysticum corpus, fide, ejusque professione, ac sacramentis unitum sub uno capite Christo, ejusque Vicario, ad aeternam felicitatem per media congruentia tendens . . . sub [hac] ratione varietatem statuum [Ecclesia] continet.*

[153] *De religione* 7.1.2.3 (*Op.* 15, 9A): *. . . sciendum est duobus modis posse distingui status in Ecclesia sic spectata, videlicet, aut in ordine ad commune bonum ac regimen spirituale Ecclesiae; vel in ordine ad bonum spirituale singulorum.*

[154] *De religione* 7.1.2.3–4 (*Op.* 15, 9A–B). Religious and others possess the "state of perfection," that is, they follow the evangelical counsels in a professed and visible way. See *De religione* 7.1.2.6–11 (*Op.* 15, 28B–30A).

[155] Vatican II's *Lumen Gentium,* §31 (DH §4157), also first distinguishes the laity by negation, writing that *[n]omine laicorum hic intelleguntur omnes christifideles praeter membra ordinis sacri et status religiosi in Ecclesia sanciti*. The text then goes on to define the laity in more positive terms: *. . . christifideles scilicet qui, utpote baptismate Christo concorporati, in Populum Dei constituti, et de munere Christi sacerdotali, prophetico et regali suo modo participes facti, pro parte sua missionem totius populi christiani in Ecclesia et in mundo exercent*.

[156] *De religione* 7.1.2.7 (*Op.* 15, 10B): *status vitae christianae non est nisi ratio aliqua vivendi stabilis et firma, ad salutem gratiae in hac vita, et gloriae in futura consequendam, ordinata et instituta. . . . Et de laicis dicitur solum teneri ad illa, quae omnibus Christianis communia sunt. . . . Unde priores [laici] statum vitae christianae profitentur*.

spiritual perfection.[157] Suárez thus presents the beginnings of a theology of the laity.[158]

We must be careful, however, not to overstate Suárez's purposes. On the one hand, his concern is to explicate and defend religious life, so his theology of the laity exists only on account of its relation to that purpose. Further, Suárez does not here envision a distinct *vocatio* of the laity that is fundamentally different from, yet complementary to, the clerical or religious state, as Vatican II does when it speaks of the "secular character" (*indoles saecularis*) of the laity.[159] Rather, Suárez understands the "state of Christian life" that the laity profess to be also professed by clergy and religious; it is the common, essential foundation of every other ecclesial state. The clergy and religious merely add something to that ecclesial way of life: the former add the identity and duties conveyed by Orders, the latter the counsels embraced by vows.[160] On the other hand, as early as his *De Ecclesia* lectures, Suárez recognizes the "rank of the faithful people" (*gradus plebis fidelium*) as a distinct ecclesial state (*status*), an insight he gleans from Pseudo-Dionysius' *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*.[161] He further intimately knew the Jesuit emphasis on interaction with, and spiritual guidance of, the laity, even defending devotional practices among the laity such as St. Ignatius of Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises.*[162] Suárez, too, affirms Ignatius' desire to disseminate broadly the *Exercises*, writing in the *De religione* that Ignatius wrote the *Exercises* not only for members of the Society of Jesus but "for the spiritual utility of the whole Christian people" and that they serve as a "novitiate for the whole human race."[163]

[157] *De religione* 7.1.2.8 (*Op.* 15, 10B–11A): *Aliunde vero etiam habet permanentiam et stabilitatem, quia per Baptismum, tanquam per professionem fidei christianae, constituitur: Baptismus autem obligationes perpetuas inducit, et ita subjicit hominem Ecclesiae, ut ab illius jure amplius subtrahi non possit. . . . [E]t in perfectione spirituali crescere, quantum voluerint, utique a Deo adjuti [sunt].*

[158] Suárez develops a "theology of the laity" much more than some of his contemporaries. See, for example, Bellarmine's "De laicis" in his *De controversiis*, vol. 2, controversy 2, bk. 3, ch. 1, 254. Bellarmine's account of the "laity" is here reduced to an account of political magistracy, to the point that the title of the English translation of this work is accurately rendered *De laicis or The Treatise on Civil Government*, trans. Kathleen E. Murphy (New York: Fordham University Press, 1928).

[159] Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium,* §31 (DH §4157): *Laicis indoles saecularis propria et peculiaris est.*

[160] *De religione* 7.1.2.9 (*Op.* 15, 11A): *Unde status perfectionis ab hoc distinguitur [ab statu christianae vitae] tanquam illi aliquid melius et perfectius addens, ideoque ab illo tanquam includens ab incluso distinguitur. Explicatur, quia in vita christiana est fundamentum totius salutis, et ad illud est necessaria . . . ergo status perfectionis habet se, quasi per additionem ad statum vitae christianae.*

[161] *De fide* 9.5.6 (*Op.* 12, 262A).

[162] It seems that Ignatius had always intended a wider audience for his *Exercises* than just religious, even delivering them to lay women in Manresa in 1522. See Elisabeth Meier Tetlow's introduction to *The Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius of Loyola*, trans. Elisabeth Meier Tetlow (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987), xi.

[163] *De religione* 10.9.5.2 (*Op.* 16.2, 1018A): *Hunc autem librum non solum, ut per illum socii proficerent, Ignatius conscripsit, sed etiam ut illius exercitiis, et documentis, ad totius Christiani populi*

Suárez senses the need to defend this claim (though he explicitly names no opponent), pointing out that the *Exercises* dispose the exercitant to receiving God's grace, separate the exercitant from the cares of the world, and teach the exercitant to run (*discurrere*) toward things eternal.[164] The *Exercises* enable the exercitant to receive "peace and quiet of soul, interior illumination, and knowledge of the good ordering of life in whatever state of life."[165] They are thus most fitting "for people of every state" and useful for both religious and laity.[166] Here Suárez explicitly shows one way in which all the faithful are "taught by God."[167] Suárez thus recognizes that the lay state of life is a conduit to grace and glory, and that it is necessary for the Church. In short, while he may not go as far as Vatican II in his delineation of the state of the laity, he does accept what Vatican II would centuries later calls the "universal call to holiness in the Church,"[168] affirming the fact that laypersons indeed inhabit an ecclesial "state" and are to pursue spiritual perfection with profit. The laity, like clergy and religious, profess and perform the *religio* of the Church.

All the faithful, then, in every ecclesial state, play an integral role in the life, functioning, and beauty of the Church. Suárez defends this claim first via St. Paul, who writes to the Corinthians and Ephesians that God places within the Church a variety of persons and duties for the edification of the body of Christ; these are gifts ordered to holy and perfect works.[169] Second, Suárez turns to

spiritualem utilitatem strenue operarentur. Unde gravissimus e D. Bernardi sacra familia vir libellum hunc novitiatum toti generi humano institutum dixit, ut refertur lib. 16 historiae Societatis, n. 127. See Niccolò Orlandini, *Historiae Societatis Jesu: Pars prima sive Ignatius*, ed. Francis Sacchini (Antwerp: Filios Martini Nutii, 1620), book 16, n. 127. See also Paul V. Murphy, "'God's Porters': The Jesuit Vocation according to Francisco Suárez," *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu* 70, no. 139 (2001): 21–22.

[164] *De religione* 10.9.7.13 (*Op.* 16.2, 1044A).

[165] *De religione* 10.9.7.13 (*Op.* 16.2, 1044A): *Denique per hoc medium comparatur pax et quies animi, et lumen internum, et cognitio ad bonam gubernationem vitae in quocumque statu.*

[166] *De religione* 10.9.7.12, 15 (*Op.* 16.2, 1044A–B): . . . *aptissimum pro cujuscumque status hominibus . . . haec exercitia nec solis religiosis, nec solis laicis, sed utrisque posse esse utilia.* Suárez does admit of the *Exercises*: *non aequaliter et indifferenter omnibus dantur*, but rather are to be accommodated to the spiritual state of the exercitant (*De religione* 10.9.7.14 [*Op.* 16.2, 1044B]). Suárez also acknowledges that the *Exercises* can help one choose not only religious life, but also another state in life. See *De religione* 10.9.7.15 (*Op.* 16.2, 1045A): *Tum etiam quia non omnes habent hujus vocationis gratiam, et tunc prosunt ad eligendum vel alium statum, vel certum vivendi modum suae saluti magis accommodatum.* Suárez prefaces this idea by stating *non eo tendunt ut omnes eligat religiosum statum, tum quia, licet status ille secundum se melior sit, aliquando non expedit respectu eligentis; unusquisque autem debet eligere id quod sibi melius est.*

[167] *Defensio fidei* 1.11.7 (*Op.* 24, 56B): *omnes sunt docibiles Dei.*

[168] *De universali vocatione ad sanctitatem in Ecclesia* is the title and topic of chapter 5 of *Lumen Gentium* (DH §4165).

[169] *De religione* 7.1.2.5 (*Op.* 15, 9B), citing 1 Corinthians 12:28 and Ephesians 4:12. Suárez also cites Matthew 19 and 1 Corinthians 7.

Pseudo-Dionysius, who in the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* and *Celestial Hierarchy* shows a proportion between diversity in the earthly Church and the "various grades of ministering and assisting angels" in the heavenly Church.[170] Suárez adds that "just as in the heavenly Church there are diverse states in the perfection of essential beatitude, and a great variety of splendors (*aureolis*) and other accidental rewards, so too it is necessary that there exist in the Church militant various states in which men may be disposed to various degrees of beatitude . . . and may merit manifold honors and rewards."[171] Third, Suárez argues that variety redounds to the beauty of the Church, turning to Psalm 44:10 where, according to the traditional exegesis, it is the Church who is described as a "queen bedecked in variety" (*Regina . . . circumdata varietate*). Suárez thus provides a twofold argument for a variety of ecclesial states: such variety is both necessary (Paul and Dionysius) and ornamental (Ps. 44). Suárez will further develop this argument for the necessity of ecclesial diversity in his exposition of catholicity. We will return to this theme in chapter 3.

1.4. Conclusion

In this chapter we have examined Suárez's definition of the Church in his early lectures *De Ecclesia* and the development of his conception of the Church in his more mature works, in particular *De legibus*, *Defensio fidei*, and *De religione*. We first argued for a minimalist reading of Suárez's definition of the Church as a "moral or political body." By this definition Suárez means that the Church can never be considered apart from her human members, and that these human members are joined together by a union of wills, governance, and law.[172] As in the temporal order, the moral union at the origin of ecclesial life remains inseparable from governance and law because there can be no way of life without

[170] *De religione* 7.1.2.6 (*Op.* 15, 10A). Suárez also employs the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* in his earlier *De Ecclesia* to argue for the inclusion of catechumens as members of the Church; see *De fide* 9.1.1.18 (*Op.* 12, 251A).

[171] *De religione* 7.1.2.6 (*Op.* 15, 10A): *. . . sicut in Ecclesia coelesti sunt diversi status in perfectione essentialis beatitudinis, et magna varietas in aureolis, et aliis accidentalibus praemiis, ita in hac Ecclesia militanti esse oportuit varios status, in quibus ad varios gradus beatitudinis, magis vel minus perfectos, homines disponantur, et multiplices honores ac praemia mereantur.* Regarding the *aureola* in scholastic theology, see Edwin Hall and Horst Uhr, "*Aureola super Auream*: Crowns and Related Symbols of Special Distinction for Saints in Late Gothic and Renaissance Iconography," *Art Bulletin* 67, no. 4 (December 1985): 567–603.

[172] The reserved comparison between the Church and the nation or political body is made even by modern ecclesiologists. See Karl Rahner, S.J., *The Church and the Sacraments*, trans. W. J. O'Hara (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963), 11–12.

a living rule and rules to live by. Yet, these features are transformed in the ecclesial order, that is, in the "new commonwealth" of the Church. The union of wills in the Church is effected by the supernatural work of the Spirit through faith, the governance of the Church receives its authority immediately from God (rather than through the community), and the law of the Church is primarily an interior law that not only commands but gives the means (grace) to fulfill such commands. At every stage, the Church is truly a *novum*. In this respect Suárez stands in continuity with, rather than in "stark contrast"[173] to, the ecclesiology put forward in the Catechism of Trent, which states that the Church, the *Christiana respublica*, "differs greatly from other commonwealths, for they depend upon human reason and prudence. The Church, however, is constituted by the wisdom and counsel of God, who calls us interiorly by the breath of the Holy Spirit—who opens the hearts of men—and exteriorly by the activity and ministry of pastors and preachers."[174]

The *novum* of the Church, however, does not lack an earthly analogue; the mystery of the Church can be understood only through a finite lens and the sociopolitical categories available to us: a city, an army, etc. The Church's lack of temporal borders, coupled with Suárez's occasional breaking down of the comparison between Church and *civitas*, suggests that the Church may also be compared to a religious order (*religio*). Indeed, it is this term, *religio*, that Suárez aligns with the Church in his *De religione*. *De religione*, a work of "practical theology," enfleshes Suárez's definition of the Church as a moral body by showing how the Church is a way of life and a way of salvation. Joined in knowledge and worship of the true God, the members of the Church profess a "mode of *religio*" and live out the "state" of the Christian life. While maintaining a uniformity in faith, this "state" of the Church manifests itself in a diversity of duties, orders, and states of life. Thus, the *religio* of the Church not only embraces persons universally from every sphere of temporal life (noble, commoner, servant, etc.), but invites them into an ecclesial state of life (lay, religious, etc.) ordered to eternal salvation. In this brief description of ecclesial life, then, Suárez begins to express what he considers a fundamental dynamic at play in the Church between unity and universality. These two "marks" (*notae*) of the Church will be examined in the following chapters.

[173] O'Malley places this Catechism in "stark contrast to the strongly institutional understandings of the 'holy Catholic Church' that theologians of the era soon constructed and made prevalent" (*Trent*, 265).

[174] *Catechismus*, 58: . . . *intelligimusque Ecclesiam ab aliis rebus publicis maxime differre, illae enim humana ratione, & prudentia nituntur; haec autem Dei sapientia, & consilio constituta est. vocavit enim nos intimo quidem spiritus sancti afflatu, qui corda hominum aperit, extrinsecus autem Pastorum & praedicatorum opera, ac ministerio*.

2

The Christic Unity of the Church

2.1. Introduction

In early modern Catholic ecclesiology, the question *quid est Ecclesia* always entailed a twofold question of *what* precisely unites the Church and, following from this, *who* constitutes this unity. These questions remained conceptually distinct yet inseparable in reality given the premise argued in chapter 1 that the Church is by definition a *congregatio* and thus cannot be considered apart from the people who constitute her, that is, in scholastic parlance, apart from her material cause. Consequently, most theologians (including Suárez) begin their treatments of ecclesial unity by identifying the principle of unity before proceeding to delineate members. Yet we should not presume from this logical ordering that the account of the principle of unity was concocted apart from real encounters with and knowledge of persons and situations. As I will show, it is very likely that practical knowledge of, for example, Greek Orthodox sharing in the sacraments with Jesuit missionaries, or validly baptized Protestants who never "left" the Roman Catholic faith because they were never raised in it, or virtuous nonbelievers in the "New World" informed certain definitions of ecclesial unity as much as the theological tradition did.

Nevertheless, any definition of such unity had to be reconciled with that tradition, which consisted of few dogmatic pronouncements on the topic and many theological opinions.[1] This variety was reflected in the early modern period.

[1] See, for example, Pope Boniface VIII's 1302 *Unam Sanctam* (DH §875): *Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanae creaturae declaramus, dicimus, diffinimus omnino esse de necessitate salutis*; the Council of Florence's 1442 declaration (DH §1351): *nullos extra catholicam Ecclesiam existentes, non solum paganos, sed nec Iudaeos aut haereticos atque schismaticos, aeternae vitae fieri posse participes*. While delineating certain conditions of salvation and the correlate relationship between those conditions and the Church, these statements still do not of themselves define ecclesial unity, which is precisely why early modern theologians had room for speculation.

Unity and Catholicity in Christ. Eric J. DeMeuse, Oxford University Press. © Oxford University Press 2022.
DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780197638637.003.0003

For example, Tommaso de Vio Cajetan (1469–1534) considers the baptismal character to be the lowest common denominator of ecclesial membership,[2] an opinion followed by the Spanish Franciscan Alfonso de Castro (1495–1558).[3] Suárez, as I shall show, makes the supernatural virtue of faith the unifying *forma Ecclesiae* and thereby the *sine qua non* of Church membership. The Italian Jesuit Robert Bellarmine offers one of the most enduring definitions of the Church militant as a "society of human beings bound together by profession of the same Christian faith and by a communion of the same sacraments under the guidance of legitimate pastors and especially of the one Vicar of Christ on earth, the Roman Pontiff."[4] Each criterion for unity—the sacramental, interior, and exterior respectively—bears consequences for ecclesial membership. For example, Cajetan and Castro recognize heretics as members of the Church since they possess the baptismal character; Suárez admits catechumens, excommunicates, and schismatics in the Church, since they retain the faith, but he excludes heretics; and Bellarmine excludes all the aforementioned by his definition.

While these conclusions are informative for understanding the different positions on ecclesial unity available in the early modern period, equally important is the means by which these various theologians arrive at such conclusions.[5] In the course of this chapter, I will examine the sources, method, and rationale grounding Suárez's definition of ecclesial unity and membership, comparing

[2] Tomasso de Vio Cajetan, *De comparatione authoritatis papae & concilii*, in *Opuscula Omnia* (Antwerp: Ioannem Keerbergium, 1612 [first published in 1512]), ch. 22, 14: *licet fides informis constituat membrum Christi secundum quid, ut dixit in tertia parte S. Thom. q. 1, a. 8, ad 2* [sic], *quia tamen latitudo datur in membris secundum quid, etiam sine fide informi, ex solo charactere sacramenti fidei constituit membrum Christi secundum quid. . . . Consequenter quamdiu character manet, non desinit esse totaliter membrum Christi.*

[3] Alfonso de Castro, *De iusta haereticorum punitione* (Salamanca: Ioannes Giunta, 1547), bk. 2, ch. 24, fol. 170: *Fateor quidem, & (meo quidem iudicio) negari non potest haereticum esse partem ecclesiae, & membrum illius, & non esse omnino ab illa separatum; quia & si fidem non habeat, habet tamen characterem baptismalem per quem primo factus est membrum ecclesiae, quo durante semper erit membrum illius*. Joseph Clifford Fenton, "Membership in the Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 112, no. 4 (1945): 295, accurately reminds us that "Alphonsus was engaged principally in trying to prove that heretics could be punished by the Church," before judging that "in explaining his position he confused membership in the Church with subjection to it."

[4] Robert Bellarmine, S.J., *De controversiis Christianae fidei adversus huius temporis hæreticos* (Venice: Joannem Malachinum, 1721), vol. 2, controversy 2, bk. 3, ch. 2, 53D: *. . . coetum hominum ejusdem Christianae fidei professione, & eorundem Sacramentorum communione colligatum, sub regimine legitimorum pastorum, ac praecipue unius Christi in terris Vicarii Romani Pontificis*. On Bellarmine's legacy see Soujeole, *Introduction*, 370–72.

[5] For example, Joseph Clifford Fenton, "The Use of the Terms Body and Soul with Reference to the Catholic Church," *Ecclesiastical Review* 110 (January 1944): 48–57, notes the dangers of reductionistic readings of Bellarmine that fail to account for various currents within his ecclesiological thought.

his foundation with that of his contemporaries, both Catholic and Protestant. Suárez's primarily spiritual and interior understanding of ecclesial unity, I will argue, is a faithful but creative recovery of Aquinas, which maintains the priority of Christic union as the basis of ecclesial union. For Suárez, faith is the "form of the Church" only because the Church's body is joined to its head through faith, by which "Christ inhabits our hearts."[6] This priority of Christ, coupled with information gleaned from missionaries, prompts Suárez to innovate in his treatment of ecclesial membership, extending the bounds of the Church to include not only schismatics but also some of those who have never heard the gospel and, arguably, the baptized children of heretics. Further, while many early modern Catholic theologians admit degrees of membership within the Church,[7] Suárez's Christological account of unity provides a more coherent rationale for gradated membership than many of his forebears and contemporaries provide,[8] thus enabling membership to extend further than many of them imagined. For Suárez, membership is gradated not only spiritually and internally (one is more or less united with Christ and the Church) but also, *and in direct proportion*, externally (one more or less evidences union with Christ and the Church). The visible elements of the Church thus manifest the internal and spiritual elements of the Church as a body manifests a living soul, and as Christ's humanity manifests his divinity. For Suárez, the fullness of the faith necessarily bears with it a fullness of visible expression in certain actions, prayers, and offices.

2.2. The Form of the Church: Faith and the Priority of Christ

2.2.1. Suárez's *Sola Fide*

As mentioned in chapter 1, Suárez's earliest definition of the Church appears in his Collegio Romano lectures (1580s) where he speaks of the Church as a moral body composed of matter and form. "Human pilgrims," Suárez writes, "are

[6] Suárez, *De fide*, 9.1.3 (*Op.* 12, 245B): *videlicet Ecclesia corpus est Christi, quod ei, ut capiti, debet esse conjunctum; conjungitur autem fide, per quam ipse in cordibus nostris inhabitat.*

[7] For example, and from the examples already given, Cajetan, *De comparatione*, ch. 22, 14, admits that *latitudo datur in membris secundum quid*. Bellarmine, *De controversiis*, vol. 2, controversy 1, bk. 3, ch. 2, 54C, writes that among those who belong to the soul and the body of the Church, *sunt etiam quasi membra viva in corpore, quamvis etiam inter istos aliqui magis, aliqui minus vitam participent, & aliqui etiam solum initium vitae habeant*.

[8] Michael Root, "Bishops, Ministry, and the Unity of the Church in Ecumenical Dialogue: Deadlock, Breakthrough, or Both?" *CTSA Proceedings* 62 (2007): 33, employs the helpful categories of "scalar" and "nonscalar" to describe gradated membership and all-or-nothing membership, respectively.

the material part of this body . . .; the form is that by which all who are part of the Church are joined into one spiritual commonwealth, and this form is chiefly faith."[9] Starting from this definition, Suárez presumes that the members of the Church can be easily discerned: all those who have faith are members; those who lack faith are outside the Church.[10] The essential criterion of ecclesial unity and membership is thus chiefly supernatural faith and not the external profession thereof, since the former, as a vital act, has the power to unite the members of the Church.[11] Just as the political body must be united by the internal power (*vis*) of a people's collective will,[12] the Church can be united only by the spiritual power of Christ in the form of the infused virtues, and chiefly faith.[13]

Suárez's doctrine stands in stark contrast to that of Bellarmine, who extrapolates from his definition that to be a member of the Church does not require "any internal virtue."[14] Of course, for Bellarmine, members of the Church ideally *do* possess internal virtue, since, citing Augustine, he notes that "the internal gifts of the Holy Spirit are the soul of the Church."[15] Yet Bellarmine imagines the possibility of people belonging *only* to the soul or to the body of the Church.[16] Such a distinction cannot be found in the writings of

[9] *De fide* 9.1.3 (*Op.* 12, 245A): *Nimirum Ecclesia corpus quoddam est non simplex, sed compositum. . . . Pars igitur materialis hujus corporis sunt homines viatores, quia solum de Ecclesia quae nunc militat loquimur; forma vero est illa qua omnes, qui partes Ecclesiae sunt, in unam spiritualem Rempublicam conjunguntur; haec autem forma fides est praecipue.*

[10] *De fide* 9.1.3 (*Op.* 12, 245B): *Ex dictis vero facile colligitur quae sint vera Ecclesiae membra. . . . [N]imirum omnes qui fidem habent, Ecclesiae membra esse, omnes vero qui illa carent extra Ecclesiam constitui.* It was common for early modern Catholic theologians to presume that ecclesial membership could be "easily" deduced from their respective definitions. See Robert Bellarmine, S.J., *De controversiis*, vol. 2, controversy 1, bk. 3, ch. 2, 53D. Indeed, this case of deduction was one of the chief motives for their efforts at definition.

[11] *De fide* 9.1.24 (*Op.* 12, 252B–253A).

[12] *Defensio* 3.2.5 (*Op.* 5, 207B). See chapter 1, section 1.2.2.

[13] *De fide* 9.1.24 (*Op.* 12, 253A), speaking of occult heretics: *nam talis haereticus non est vere membrum Christi, cum non sit illi per actum vitae spiritualis ullo modo conjunctus. De fide* 9.1.12 (*Op.* 12, 248B), speaking of mortal sinners: *sunt tamen membra, quia non carent omni motu vitae spiritualis, cum retineant fidem, per quam Christo aliqualiter conjunguntur. De fide* 9.1.19 (*Op.* 12, 251A), speaking of catechumens: *membrum enim visibile potest interdum manere conjunctum per solam invisibilem formam.* For Suárez, as will be argued, membership "in Christ" is the equivalent of membership "in the Church." See also Francis X. Lawlor, S.J., "Occult Heresy and Membership in the Church," *Theological Studies* 10, no. 4 (December 1949): 544; Francesco Spanedda, "L'ecclesiologia di Francesco Suárez," PhD diss., Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1937, 73–74.

[14] Bellarmine, *De controversiis*, vol. 2, controversy 1, bk. 3, ch. 2, 54A: *non putamus requiri ullam internam virtutem.* Other authors of the period offer variations on internal and external criteria. See Fenton, "Membership in the Church," 296–97.

[15] Bellarmine, *De controversiis*, vol. 2, controversy 1, bk. 3, ch. 2, 54A: *Ecclesiam esse corpus vivum, in quo est anima & corpus, & quidem anima sunt interna dona Spiritus sancti, Fides, Spes, Charitas etc.*

[16] Bellarmine, *De controversiis*, vol. 2, controversy 1, bk. 3, ch. 2, 54B: *aliqui sint de anima, & non de corpore . . . aliqui sint de corpore, & non de anima.*

Suárez.[17] For him, to be a member of the Church is to possess the form of the Church, or the internal virtue of faith, without exception. As will be shown, this criterion does not preclude external manifestations of faith. However, when we are speaking of the essential form by which the Church (the *congregatio*) is united, we are speaking of something invisible in itself (*in se*).[18]

Linus Hofmann argues that Suárez's understanding of ecclesial unity and membership is difficult to harmonize with the Catholic tradition.[19] Admittedly, Suárez does extend the idea of faith as the *forma Ecclesiae* to novel lengths, as will be explored. Nevertheless, and to use Suárez's own language from our introduction, "not everything that is new is reprehensible," but things are sometimes introduced according to the needs of the time and "for the perfection of those things which are ancient."[20] Suárez's understanding of ecclesial unity, I argue, faithfully receives the tradition and stretches it in light of new circumstances and even new dogmatic pronouncements.

The idea that faith is the principle of ecclesial unity has clear precedents within the tradition,[21] not least of which in one of the "oldest and most common terms for the Church, the *congregatio fidelium.*"[22] Indeed, the idea of the Church as a "congregation of the faithful" provides the foundation for assertions of faith as the principle of ecclesial unity. In the generations preceding Suárez, St. Catherine of Siena (1347–1380) describes the Church as the universal body

[17] In the *Defensio* 1.15.10 (*Op.* 24, 76B), Suárez will instead speak in more Augustinian terms of belonging to the Church "in spirit and mind (*animo saltem et mente*)," though he uses this phrase sparingly and does not speak correlatively of the possibility of belonging to the Church only in a bodily way.

[18] *De fide* 9.1.19 (*Op.* 12, 251A): *invisibilem formam*; *Defensio fidei* 1.8.8 (*Op*. 24, 39A).

[19] Linus Hofmann, "Die Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche nach der Lehre des Franz Suarez," *Trierer theologische Zeitschrift* 67 (1958): 160: *Die Vereinheitlichung des Gliedbegriffes und damit des Kirchenbegriffes ist bei Suarez soweit getrieben, daß sie mit der katholischen Tradition nicht leicht zu vereinbaren ist.* It is notable that Suárez was never censored for his opinions on ecclesial unity. Spanedda, "L'ecclesiologia," 39–40, acutely points out that not even fellow Jesuit Gabriel Vásquez condemned this teaching. Vásquez was Suárez's academic rival and often and openly criticized the opinions and behavior of Suárez.

[20] *De religione* 10.6.5.24 (*Op.* 16.2, 862A).

[21] In addition to the authorities provided in the text, see, for example, Paschasius Radbertus (785–865), *De fide, spe, et caritate*, in *Corpus Christianorum*, ed. Bedae Paulus (New York: Brepols, 1990), bk. 1, ch. 13, 52: *Et tamen una eademque [fides] in omnibus iure creditur. Ex qua unum corpus in Christo efficimur. Per quam uno baptismo consecramur et in una spe vocationis nostre. Una et sola fides est qua renascimur*.

[22] Joseph A. Komonchak, *Who Are the Church?: The Père Marquette Lecture in Theology 2008* (Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2008), 31. Yves Congar, O.P., makes an identical claim in *True and False Reform in the Church*, trans. Paul Philibert, O.P. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2011), 84. For a bevy of patristic references defending this claim, see Henri de Lubac, S.J., *The Splendor of the Church*, trans. Michael Mason (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2006), 103–4.

of creatures who "share in the light of holy faith."[23] Gabriel Biel (1425–1495) explicitly declares that faith is the *forma Ecclesiae* when discussing the ecclesial mark of sanctity in his *Canonis misse expositio*: "The Church is called holy on account of its form," which is "true faith in Christ." He adds that some even define the Church as "the mystical body of Christ animated by faith."[24] Thomas Stapleton (1535–1598), writing in the 1570s, adopts a similar line of reasoning in associating faith with sanctity, "for the Church is nothing if not a congregation of the faithful."[25] In a later work, he highlights the relationship between faith and unity: faith is the "chief *ratio* of ecclesial unity, without which all other bonds are nothing."[26] While Suárez at times associates faith with sanctity and the other marks of the Church,[27] he homes in on the relationship between faith and unity in a manner akin to Stapleton: "The Church has one faith," he writes, "which is its first (*prima*) form, joining the parts of the Church."[28]

Suárez loosely grounds his teaching that the Church is a moral body composed of people with true faith in Christ in a long list of scriptural, papal, conciliar, and patristic sources.[29] One of the most informative references comes from Augustine's *De fide et operibus.* Suárez summarizes his authority thus: "the

[23] Catherine of Siena, *Lettera XXXIX a Niccolò da Osimo*, in *L'opere di S. Caterina da Siena*, vol. 2, ed. Girolamo Gigli (Lucca: Leonardi Venturini, 1721), 281: *Santa Chiesa, perchè ella è el corpo universale di tutte le Creature, che participano el lume della Santa Fede.* She offers a similar description in *The Dialogue of the Seraphic Virgin Catherine of Siena*, trans. Algar Thorold (Westminster, MD: Newman, 1943), 43.

[24] Gabriel Biel, *Canonis misse expositio*, ed. Heiko Oberman and William J. Courtenay (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1963), lec. 22, 137: *Secundo dicitur ecclesia sancta ratione formae: non ratione partium materialium, cum enim ecclesia corpus sit mysticum: ad instar corporis veri, habet partes materiales et formam. Materiales homines fluentes, & sibiinuicem succedentes. Formam vero mysticam, Christi fidem veram. Propter quod ecclesiam diffinientes aiunt: Ecclesia est corpus Christi mysticum fide animatum. Haec autem Christi fides vera est, recta, & sancta: propter quam totum corpus ecclesiae dicitur sanctum: sicut homo sanctus est propter animam sanctam: licet in corpore aliqua sit macula, seu turpitudo.*

[25] Thomas Stapleton, *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium demonstratio methodica* (Paris: Michael Sonnius, 1582), 14: *Primum itaque propter fidem Ecclesia sancta dicitur. Est enim non nisi fidelium congregatio.*

[26] Thomas Stapleton, *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium relectio scholastica & compendaria* (Antwerp: Ioannes Keerbergius, 1596), 57: *Et haec [fides] est maxima ratio unitatis, sine qua caetera omnia vincula nulla sunt.*

[27] *Defensio fidei* 1.3.10 (*Op.* 24, 16B): *Docent [Anglicanae] enim Ecclesiam credendum esse Unam, Sanctam et Catholicam; non potest autem esse una, sine unitate fidei; neque sancta sine vera et divina fide, sine qua impossibile est placere Deo; neque catholica sine fide universali, quae omnia vera dogmata complectatur.*

[28] *De fide* 9.4.1 (*Op.* 12, 259B): *. . . habet unam fidem, quae est forma prima, Ecclesiae partes conjugens.*

[29] *De fide* 9.1.3 (*Op.* 12, 245A–B): *Desumitur conclusio ex Concilio Lateranensi, et Nicolao Papa citatis . . . et ex Paulo ad Roman. 12, 1 Corinth. 12, Ephes. 1 . . . ad Eph. 2 . . . Matth. 16 . . . ad Eph. 4 . . . ad Coloss. 1 . . . et primae ad Corinth. 3.*

Church is the body of Christ which must be united to him as to a head; yet it is thus united by faith, through which He inhabits our hearts."[30] This passage reveals two important aspects of Suárez's ecclesiology: the identity of the *Ecclesia* and the *corpus Christi*, and therein the identity of union with the Church and union with Christ. Conversely, a person's union with Christ is identical with that person's commencement of the ecclesial way of life. And according to Suárez, the ecclesial way of life begins with faith.[31] As the Council of Trent states in its decree on justification, "faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation and root of all justification."[32] Since, as we argued in chapter 1,[33] the way of salvation exists only within the Church, and if "faith is the beginning of human salvation," then, correlatively, faith would be the beginning of Church membership. For Suárez, faith is the first form of the Church because it is the first means by which a person enjoys spiritual union with Christ and his body.[34]

Suárez follows his evocation of Augustine with a brief but important statement: "St. Thomas also has taught this."[35] Suárez cites *ST* II-II, q. 1, art. 9, ad 3, where St. Thomas responds to the objection that not all the faithful believe in God, but only those who have formed (or living) faith, and thus it is unfitting for the creed to be handed on with the words "I believe in one God." St. Thomas replies that the faith is handed on in the creed "as if from the person of the whole Church, which is united through faith." So far, Suárez and St. Thomas

[30] *De fide* 9.1.3 (*Op.* 12, 245B): *Confirmatur ex Augustino, de Fide et operibus, cap. 16, ubi dicta ratione utitur, quia videlicet Ecclesia corpus est Christi, quod ei, ut capiti, debet esse conjunctum; conjungitur autem fide, per quam ipse in cordibus nostris inhabit.* In *De fide et operibus* 16, in *PL* 40:215, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris: Garnier, 1865), Augustine is expositing 1 Corinthians 3:11 in which St. Paul describes Christ as the "foundation." Augustine writes: *Si autem Christus, procul dubio fides Christi: per fidem quippe habitat Christus in cordibus nostris, sicut idem Apostolus dicit (Eph. 3:17).*

[31] *De fide* 9.1.3 (*Op.* 12, 245B): *quoniam cum multi homines Ecclesiam componant, oportet eos aliqua una forma copulari . . . oportet eam formam supernaturalem esse, et ad gratiae ordinem pertinere; prima autem forma inter supernaturales virtutes, fides est.* Spanedda, "L'ecclesiologia di Francesco Suárez," 73–74, states Suárez's position well: *Perchè infatti, secondo il Suàrez, la fede è forma constitutiva della Chiesa? Perchè unisce gli uomini a Cristo, come membra al loro capo. La fede dunque è il principio prossimo, formale, che realizza l'unione degli uomini con Cristo; e questa unione con Cristo determina automaticamente l'unione con la Chiesa Corpo del Cristo.*

[32] Council of Trent, session 6, chapter 8 (DH §1532): . . . *ut scilicet per fidem ideo justificari dicamur, quia fides est humanae salutis initium, fundamentum et radix omnis justificationis.*

[33] Chapter 1, section 1.3.3.

[34] Suárez makes this explicit statement elsewhere in his 1583 *Lectiones de fide*, ed. Karl Deuringer (Granada: Facultad de teologia, 1967), 260: *Nemo enim potest accipere a Christo influxum supernaturalis vitae, nisi sit illi supernaturaliter coniunctus. Quae coniunctio fundamentaliter fit per fidem.* Suárez's position reflects that of Juan de Torquemada, O.P., *Summa de Ecclesia* (Venice, 1561), bk. 1, ch. 1, 3, who refers to union with Christ as the formal cause of ecclesial unity: *Causa autem materialis sunt ipsi fideles. . . . Causa vero formalis est unitas corporis mistici cum Christo.*

[35] *De fide* 9.1.3 (*Op.* 12, 245B): *quod etiam D. Thomas 2.2, q. 1, art. 9, ad 3, docuit.*

agree. Yet the latter continues: "However, the faith of the Church is faith formed [by charity], and such faith is found in all those who are of the Church both nominally and rightly . . . in order that if some of the faithful lack faith formed [by charity], they may seek to attain this form."[36] For Aquinas, faith formed by charity unites the faithful, and those who lack charity due to mortal sin (the *mali*) are joined to the "person of the whole Church" only by means of those who already possess faith formed by charity. Arguably for Aquinas, then, only faith formed by charity is the *forma Ecclesiae*. Elsewhere Aquinas even seems to give charity the pride of place, referring to ecclesial unity simply as the "effect of charity" and adding that charity unites the whole Church in unity of spirit.[37] For this reason, Charles Journet considers charity to be the created form of the Church for Aquinas.[38]

Does Suárez depart from Aquinas in his insistence that faith "chiefly" unites the Church? Is this an instance of what George Sabra disapprovingly calls the "colour[ing of Aquinas' ecclesiology] by other concerns and viewpoints" after Trent?[39] Suárez cites Aquinas very sparingly throughout this section of his treatise *De Ecclesia*, though he could have employed numerous texts to his advantage. For example, later in *ST* II-II, q. 4, a. 5, Aquinas writes, "Unformed faith is common to all members of the Church,"[40] and in his *Expositio* on the first and second decretal, Aquinas even uses language identical to that of Suárez: "The unity of the Church exists chiefly (*praecipue*) on account of the unity of faith, for the Church is nothing other than a congregation of the faithful."[41] I suggest that Suárez does not aptly employ Aquinas in this section for three reasons. First, Suárez's method described in his 1579 letter to Mercurian suggests a desire to rely more heavily on biblical and patristic sources in his theological works than on the authority of the scholastics, an approach his treatise *De Ecclesia* reflects

[36] Aquinas, *ST* II-II, q. 1, a. 9, ad 3: *confessio fidei traditur in symbolo quasi ex persona totius Ecclesiae, quae per fidem unitur. Fides autem Ecclesiae est fides formata, talis enim fides invenitur in omnibus illis qui sunt numero et merito de Ecclesia. Et ideo confessio fidei in symbolo traditur secundum quod convenit fidei formatae, ut etiam si qui fideles fidem formatam non habent, ad hanc formam pertingere studeant.*

[37] Aquinas, *ST* II-II, q. 39, a. 1, in reference to the sin of schism: *Et ideo peccatum schismatis proprie est speciale peccatum ex eo quod intendit se ab unitate separare quam caritas facit. Quae non solum alteram personam alteri unit spirituali dilectionis vinculo, sed etiam totam Ecclesiam in unitate spiritus.*

[38] Charles Journet, *L'Église du Verbe Incarné*, vol. 2: *Sa structure interne et son unite catholique* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1951), 570: *Il y a donc, dans le corps mystique, deux formes ou principes d'unification numérique, deux formes ou principes d'unicité: la charité et l'Esprit saint.* When emphasizing the created form, however, Journet designates charity, 2:571–72.

[39] George Sabra, *Thomas Aquinas' Vision of the Church* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald, 1987), 186.

[40] Aquinas, *ST* II-II, q. 4, a. 5, ad 4: *Fides autem informis est communis omnibus membris Ecclesiae.*

[41] Aquinas, *Expositio*: *Unitas autem Ecclesiae est praecipue propter fidei unitatem: nam Ecclesia nihil est aliud quam congregatio fidelium.*

well.[42] Second, these were classroom lectures for young Jesuits, and Suárez likely recognized that knowledge of the biblical and patristic basis of Catholic ecclesiology would be essential for those destined for Protestant lands. Third, Suárez perhaps recognized the ambiguity in Aquinas' teaching on the *forma Ecclesiae*, an ambiguity pronouncedly revealed in Aquinas' inconsistent teaching on the ecclesial status of "faithful sinners" (*fideles peccatores*) or the wicked (*mali*), that is, those who possess faith unformed by charity on account of mortal sin. As will be shown, this inconsistency was exacerbated by the succeeding tradition of Thomistic commentators and required clarification in light of the Council of Trent.

2.2.2. Faithful Sinners and the Form of the Church

Aquinas' earliest position on the question of *fideles peccatores* appears in his *Scriptum* on book 3 of the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard wherein he discusses Christ's headship. St. Thomas considers faithful sinners lacking charity to pertain only *materially* to the unity of the Church, thus they cannot be called members properly or formally, but only equivocally.[43] In one manuscript, he suggests that they could be called dead members (*nisi membrum mortuum*), but two other manuscripts, including the autograph, do not even grant this (*sicut nec membrum mortuum*).[44] St. Thomas even entertains the opinion, since attributed

[42] See Introduction, section I.2.

[43] Aquinas, *III Sent.*, d. 13, qu. 2, a. 2, sol. 2, in Maria Fabianus Moos, O.P., ed., *Scriptum super sententiis Magistri Petri Lombardi* (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1933), bk. 3, 414: *Homines autem fideles peccatores pertinent quidem aliquo modo ad unitatem Ecclesiae inquantum continuantur ei per fidem, quae est unitas materialis; non tamen possunt dici membra proprie, nisi sicut membrum mortuum, [scilicet] aequivoce*. St. Thomas speaks of faith as effecting material unity because he is speaking of a unity *per colligationem eorum ad invicem per nervos et juncturas*, an allusion to Ephesians 4:16.

[44] In his critical edition of the text, Maria Fabianus Moos, O.P. notes that the *nisi sicut membrum mortuum* alternatively reads *nec membrum mortuum* (*a*) and *sicut nec membrum mortuum* (*ß*). *Scriptum*, bk. 3, 414. The autograph (BAV Vat Lat 9851, ff. 31rb in calce) refers to such sinners as *infideles,* though this word is subsequently struck through: *homines autem ~~infideles~~ peccatores pertinent quidem aliquo modo ad unitatem / (31va) ecclesie inquantum continuantur ei per fidem que est unitas materialis, non tamen ~~proprie~~ possunt dici membra proprie, sicut nec membrum mortuum, nisi equivoce, et ideo quia unitas corporis ex membris consistet, ideo quidam dicunt quod non pertinent ad unitatem corporis ecclesie quamvis pertineant ad unitatem ecclesie. Et sicut operationes que sunt ad alterum possunt aliquo modo fieri per membrum arida, ut percutere vel aliquid huiusmodi, non tamen operationes que sunt anime in membris, ita nec mali recipiunt operationem spiritualis vite a spiritu sancto, et tamen spiritus sanctus per eos operatur spiritualem vitam in aliis secundum quod aliis sacramenta ministrant vel alios docent. Set homines fideles in gracia existentes uniuntur ~~respectu~~ secundum tertiam unionem, que est formalis respectu huius secunde, et iterum ~~respectu~~ secundum quartam que est completiva totius; et ideo horum proprie christus dicitur capud.* Many thanks to Mark Johnson for transcribing Aquinas' nearly illegible handwriting.

to Alexander of Hales, that these sinners pertain to the unity of the Church, but not to the unity of the body of the Church, a distinction that he abandons, along with the language of "equivocal" membership, in the later *Summa.*[45]

Aquinas revisits the question of *fideles peccatores* in *ST* III, q. 8, a. 3, on Christ's headship. Aquinas argues that Christ is the head of all men, but according to diverse gradations (*secundum diversos grados*).[46] Christ is *actually* (*in actu*) united only to the blessed, to those with charity, and to those with faith. He is *potentially* (*in potentia*) united to the predestined who are not yet united with Him, and to those non-predestined pilgrims whose potency will never be reduced to act.[47] Faith alone, then, even if unformed by charity, constitutes one an actual member of the Church.[48] In Aquinas' response to objection 2, however, he wavers on this position, arguing that those whose faith is unformed by charity are not members in act but only in potency, but then he adds, "or perhaps they are members imperfectly through unformed faith, which unites to Christ relatively (*secundum quid*) and not simply (*simpliciter*)" since they still receive "some vital act" from Christ (that is, belief).[49] While Aquinas clearly distances himself here from his earlier position in the *Scriptum*, he is still reticent to include *fideles peccatores* as actual members of the Church, a position supported by his statement from *ST* II-II, q. 1, a. 5 outlined earlier.

This reticence re-emerges in the commentarial tradition. The fifteenth-century Dominican Juan de Torquemada, favoring the language of the *Scriptum*, speaks of mortal sinners as members only "equivocally," since a dead member cannot be considered a true member of the Church.[50] Dominicans Melchior Cano and Domingo Bañez, reading Aquinas' position in light of chapter 2 of

[45] Journet, *L'Église du Verbe Incarné*, 2:575: *Telle est la manière de parler d'Alexandre d´Alès, et de saint Thomas dans les Sentences. Est-elle heureuse? Il ne semble pas, et saint Thomas ne la conserva pas dans la Somme*.

[46] George Sabra writes that "Thomas made no artificial distinction between members of Christ and members of the church"; see *Thomas Aquinas' Vision of the Church*, 175. This position concurs with that of Journet, *L'Église du Verbe Incarné*, 2:1059: *Membre du Christ, membre de l'Église, membre du corps mystique de l'Église, saint Thomas emploie indifféremment ces expressions*.

[47] St. Thomas already uses the language of potency and act in reference to Church membership in *Super Sent.* bk. 3, d. 13, q. 2, a. 2, qc. 2, co.

[48] In Suárez's commentary on this text, *De incarnatione*, q. 8, a. 3, no. 4 (*Op.* 17, 641B–42A), he does not comment on the members of Christ "in act" but rather directs his reader to his treatise *De Ecclesia.*

[49] *ST* III, q. 8, a. 3, ad 2.

[50] Juan de Torquemada, O.P., *Summa de Ecclesia* (Venice, 1561), bk. 1, ch. 57, 69. Here he cites the principle of Hugh of St. Victor: *Nihil in corpore Christi mortuum, nihil extra corpus vivum*. In his exposition of Aquinas, Torquemada seems to favor the treatment of *fideles peccatores* from the *Scriptum* and renders the relevant passage in a version that agrees with the autograph. See also Joseph Clifford Fenton's comments on Torquemada's position in "Membership in the Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 112 (1945): 293.

Aristotle's *De anima*, argue that, in the words of Cano, "the wicked are certainly *parts* of the Church, but they are not *members* of the Church or of Christ [because they are not living]. They are members of the devil, and yet they are judged to be parts of the Church."[51] The Jesuit Francis Coster (1531–1619) compares the wicked to bodily humors: "phlegm, mucus, pus, saliva, overflowing blood, and excrement of the body of Christ. For those things are neither members nor parts of a living man, but nevertheless are not outside the human body."[52] Such comments did not go unnoticed by Protestant controversialists who used identical arguments to define the ecclesial status of the *mali*.[53] As Lutheran Johann Gerhard (1582–1637) argues before the Council of Trent "it was a common and unanimous doctrine of the Roman church that the evil are members of the church only equivocally and that they are just like excremental humors in the body."[54]

[51] Melchior Cano, O.P., *De locis theologicis libri duodecim* (Louvain: Servatius Sassenus, 1564 [first edition 1563]), bk. 4, 217: *Docet item Aristoteles auctor sentiendi gravissimus, cui etiam Divus Thomas assentit, membra mortua non aliter esse membra atque ea, quae picta & figurata sunt: peccator ergo, cum mortuus sit, membrum ecclesiae & pars vere ac proprie non est, sed aequivoce ac figurate.* Cano, *De locis theologicis*, bk. 4, 273: *Aliud porro est partes ecclesiae esse, aliud esse ecclesiae membra. Nomen siquidem partis latius diffunditur, nomen membri contractius est. Pars ad totum refertur membrum ad animantis corpus. Ita pars sine vita invenitur, ut in lapide, ligno, ac caeteris eiusmodi. Membrum autem vere et proprie sine vita ne intelligi quidem potest. Quamobrem improbi partes quidem ecclesiae sunt; membra ecclesiae aut Christi non sunt. Sunt autem diaboli membra. At in ecclesia esse censentur, civesque civitati huic & annumerati & adscripti; cives mali & flagitiosi tamen*. Domingo Bañez, O.P., *Comentarios Ineditos a la Tercera Parte de Santo Tomas*, vol. 1, ed. R. P. Mtro. Vicente Beltran de Heredia, O.P. (Matriti, 1951), 189: *Peccatores fideles sunt partes Ecclesiae simpliciter loquendo. Probatur. Quia pars minus dicit quam membrum in rebus naturalibus, nam capilli sunt partes hominis et non sunt membra. Item peccatores fideles habent jus ad petendum sacramentis Ecclesiae: ergo sunt partes.* In his *Commentaria in secundam secundae angelici doctoris D. Thomae* (Venice: Bernardus Iunta, 1586), col. 107, Bañez also invokes Aristotle's *De anima* to speak of heretics as *membra praescissa, sicut manus abscissa a corpore, quae non sit est vera manus, ut ait Arist. 2.de anima.*

[52] Francis Coster, S.J., *Apologia Francisci Costeri Societatis Iesu, pro tertia parte enchiridii sui, de Ecclesia: contra Franciscum Gummarum professorem calvinismi* (Cologne: Arnold Mylius, 1604), 631: *Qui non habet spiritum Christi, non est membrum Christi: sed potest esse flegma, pituita, sanies, saliva, sanguis abundans, & excrementum corporis Christi. Ista enim viventis hominis neque membra sunt, neque partes; & tamen non sunt extra corpus humanum*. Coster goes on to point out the similitude between the human and ecclesial body.

[53] See, for example, Johann Gerhard, *On the Church*, in *Theological Commonplaces XXV*, trans. Richard J. Dinda, ed. Benjamin T. G. Mayes (St. Louis: Concordia, 2010), §66, 105: "Dead members are not true members but are called so equivocally." Gerhard goes on to cite Aristotle's *De anima* to defend this point. Johann Andreas Quenstedt, *Theologia didactico-polemica* (Wittenberg: Johannis Ludolphi Quenstedii, 1685), part IV, chapter 15, section 2, response to objections, no. 8, writes: *Disting. inter esse partem Ecclesiae, & esse membrum Ecclesiae . . . Impii & hypocritae partes quidem verae Ecclessiae dici possunt, membra verò propriè dicta nequaquam.*

[54] Gerhard, *On the Church*, §65, 102. Even modern Thomistic commentators remain divided on the question of *fideles peccatores.* Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., *Christ the Savior: A Commentary on the Third Part of St. Thomas' Theological Summa*, trans. Dom Bede Rose (St. Louis: Herder, 1950),

The Council of Trent addresses the question of *fideles peccatores* in two places, once in chapter 7 of its decree on justification, stating that "faith without hope and charity neither unites a man perfectly with Christ nor makes him a living member of his body,"[55] and the other in the canons of the same decree where the Council anathematizes anyone who says that "the man who has faith without charity is not a Christian."[56] Suárez employs this latter text to defend his thesis on ecclesial unity:

> Christians, however, are those who are members both of Christ and of the Church. . . . Thus, it is clear that faith is the proper form of the Church, which truly remains in sinners and whereby there is no doubt that such are called members of the Church *simpliciter* (although the question seems to be a manner of speaking).[57]

Suárez goes further than Aquinas and his commentators by recognizing *fideles peccatores* as members of the Church "simply." Suárez does acknowledge, as implied by the Council, that "sinners are said to be dead and imperfect members" of the Church,[58] and he presumes this conciliar text lurks behind the distinction made by others between parts and members. Nevertheless, Suárez rejects that distinction as "scrupulous" and "without foundation"[59] and even questions the

317, emphasizes the *actual* membership of *fideles peccatores*, noting that "it is already something of great importance to preserve the gift of infused faith," while Benoît-Dominique de la Soujeole, *Introduction*, 102, has more recently drawn a similar conclusion to that of Torquemada, noting that St. Thomas "distinguishes between actual members (the blessed, those in a state of grace here below, the angels) and potential members (sinners, unbelievers)."

[55] Council of Trent, session 6, Decree on Justification, chapter 7 (DH §1531): *Nam fides, nisi ad eam spes accedat et caritas, neque unit perfecte cum Christo, neque corporis eius vivum membrum efficit.*

[56] Council of Trent, session 6, Decree on Justification, canon 28 (DH §1578): *Si quis dixerit, amissa per peccatum gratia simul et fidem semper amitti, aut fidem, quae remanet, non esse veram fidem, licet non sit viva, aut eum, qui fidem sine caritate habet, non esse Christianum: anathema sit.*

[57] *De fide* 9.1.10 (*Op.* 12, 247B–48A): *in Concilio Tridentino, sessione 6, canone 28, fideles peccatores dicuntur veri Christiani: Christiani autem sunt, qui et Christi et Ecclesiae membra sunt. . . . Denique ostensum est fidem esse propriam formam Ecclesiae, quae tamen vera in peccatoribus manet, quare (quamvis quaestio videatur de modo loquendo) dubium non est hos esse dicendos simpliciter membra ecclesiae.* The *Opera omnia* text mistakenly reads *canone 18.*

[58] *De fide* 9.1.12 (*Op.* 12, 248A): *fatemur peccatores esse dicendos membra mortua et imperfecta, ut loquitur Tridentinum, sessione 6, cap. 7.*

[59] *De fide* 9.1.11 (*Op.* 12, 247B–48A): *Nonulli praeterea Catholici dicunt peccatores esse quidem partes Ecclesiae, sed non membra. . . . Illa enim praedictorum Catholicorum scrupulosa distinctio, parti et membri, in proposito non habet fundamentum.* Suárez's pupil, Gregory of Valencia, S.J., *Commentaria theologicorum* (Lyons: Horatius Cardon, 1609), vol. 3, col. 136, likewise deems the parts/members distinction to be semantics: *quanquam quaestio est omnis de nomine.*

language of *mortua membra* since the sinner still participates in life to some inferior degree (*aliquem inferioris vitae gradum*):

> Since they lack the life of charity, which is the proper and perfect life of the Church, sinners are called dead members; they are members nonetheless since, by retaining faith, through which they are joined with Christ in some way, they do not lack all movement of the spiritual life.[60]

Suárez thus argues that *fideles peccatores* enjoy "imperfect union" (*unio imperfecta*) with Christ, which renders them "imperfect" members of the Church. Since this union pales in comparison with that of the just, however, Suárez suggests that many in the tradition negatively exaggerated the ecclesial status of sinners, some even seeming to place them outside of the Church.[61] Yet according to Suárez, the Council of Trent clearly affirms their ecclesial status, and it is through the lens of the Council that Suárez makes his judgment.

In light of the Council of Trent, then, Suárez emphasizes faith as the *forma Ecclesiae* in a more radical way than his predecessors. Nevertheless, his argument and rationale align with the teaching of Aquinas in three ways. First, both thinkers give priority to the inner reality of the Church. Indeed, Suárez does so in a way that is admittedly more common among his Protestant contemporaries than his fellow Catholics.[62] For example, while Bellarmine defines the theological virtues as the form of the Church, his definition bears no *necessary* relation to his criteria for ecclesial membership, which remain primarily (though not exclusively) exterior.[63] In other words, for Bellarmine, there is no necessary

[60] *De fide* 9.1.12 (*Op.* 12, 248B): *. . . peccatores ergo quoniam carent charitatis vita, quae est propria et perfecta vita Ecclesiae, dicuntur mortua membra; sunt tamen membra, quia non carent omni motu vitae spiritualis, cum retineant fidem, per quam Christo aliqualiter conjunguntur.*

[61] *De fide* 9.1.12 (*Op.* 12, 248B): *Quoniam vero haec unio imperfecta est, et ad salutem non sufficit, ideo Patres interdum, et comparatione facta ad justos, et ad exaggerandam* [sic] *miserum peccatorum statum, illos videntur constituere extra Ecclesiam.*

[62] Suárez seems to acknowledge this fact in the *Defensio fidei* 1.7.3 (*Op.* 24, 31B), when he reminds his Anglican reader that "Catholics even teach [that faith is the form of the Church]." According to Philip Melanchthon, *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, in *The Book of Concord*, ed. Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert, trans. Charles Arand et al. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 177, the church "truly exists, consisting of true believing and righteous people scattered throughout the entire world." Johann Andreas Quenstedt, *Theologia didactico-polemica*, part IV, chapter 15, section 2, thesis, writes that *membra autem Ecclesiae viva, vera & propriè dicta sunt omnes & soli fideles*, by which he means those who possess the gift of faith. John Calvin, *Opera selecta: Institutionis Christianae religionis*, ed. Petrus Barth and Guilelmus Niesel (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2018 [1559]), vol. 5, bk. 4, ch. 2, no. 5, speaks of the *charitatis coniunctionem sic a fide unitate pendere*, adding that the church, in contrasst to the factions of the impious, is a *conspirationem fidelium.*

[63] Joseph Clifford Fenton, "The Use of the Terms Body and Soul with Reference to the Catholic Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 110 (January 1944): 48–57, cautions against treating these

correspondence between the form and matter of the Church. Suárez teaches the opposite: form and matter are inseparable. Indeed, what makes an aggregate of *viatores* into a *congregatio fidelium* is precisely the possession of an interior, supernatural form. Here Suárez is faithful to Aquinas who, as we saw in his account of *religio* in chapter 1,[64] gives primacy to the inner reality of the Church but never at the expense of the exterior reality.[65]

Second, both thinkers employ this interior emphasis to argue with ease for the existence of the Church in the Old Testament. Although the Israelites of the Old Testament lacked the same visible institutions and sacraments as contained under the New Law, Aquinas nevertheless grants that the *mens fidelium* could be justified through faith in Christ under the Old Law, and thus they could belong to the *Ecclesia*.[66] In the Naples and Madrid manuscripts of the *Tertia pars*, Aquinas clearly states that grace was conferred to the just of the Old Testament solely on account of their "faith in the passion of Christ" and not via any external sign.[67] In a similar vein, Suárez argues that the Church existed with Adam and

analogies as "realities which demanded an explanation in their own right," rather than as helpful but fluid metaphors for understanding the mystery of the Church. Bellarmine, Fenton acccurately argues, employs the image of body and soul in various and irreducibly distinct ways. Nevertheless, I think the critique of *this particular* employment of the body/soul image in chapter 2 of the *De Ecclesia militante* is justified in that it compromises the unity of the church by presenting the relationship between matter and form in terms of a duality. On this particular critique, see, for example, Soujeole, *Introduction*, 363.

[64] Chapter 1, section 1.3.2.

[65] See Aloys Grillmeier, "The Mystery of the Church," trans. Kevin Smyth, in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), vol. 1, 138; Martin Grabmann, *Thomas Aquinas: His Personality and Thought*, trans. Virgil Michel, O.S.B. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1928), 174.

[66] *ST* I-II, q. 103, a. 2, cor.: *Poterat mens fidelium, tempore legis, per fidem coniungi Christo incarnato et passo, et ita ex fide Christi iustificabuntur.* The identity of union with Christ and union with the Church discussed earlier allows us to draw the logical conclusion that the just of the Old Law thus belonged to the Church, a point St. Thomas makes explicit later in *ST* III, q. 8, a. 3, ad 3: *Et ideo antiqui patres, servando legalia sacramenta, ferebantur in Christum per fidem et dilectionem eandem qua et nos in ipsum ferimur. Et ita patres antiqui pertinebant ad idem corpus Ecclesiae ad quos nos pertinemus.* Here, Aquinas speaks of faith and love as that which binds the ancient fathers to the Church.

[67] *ST* III, q. 62, a. 6, ad 3, as recorded in Mauro Turrini, "Établissement critique du texte du 'De sacramentis in communi' de Thomas d'Aquin: 'Tertia Pars,' qq. 60–65," *Studi Medievali* 3, no. 39 (December 1998): 933: *videtur quod circumcisio sicut et alia sacramenta erat solum signum fidei iustificantis. . . . Et ideo circumcisio non habet in se virtutem nec (Ma = neque) conferendi gratiam nec (Ma = neque) auferendi peccatum. Sed hoc fiebat per fidem passionis Christi quam circumcisio designabat.* This doctrine does not mean that such faith was not manifest by any external sign. Rather, it indicates only that the external sign did not confer grace in the same manner as the sacraments of the New Law. The current, readily available, and still uncritical edition of the *Tertia pars* does not take into account the Naples and Madrid manuscripts with notable effect: *videtur quod circumcisio erat signum fidei iustificantis. . . . Et ideo in circumcisione conferebatur gratia inquantum erat signum passionis Christi futurae.*

Eve on account of their faith, which was passed on to later generations. It is the very notion of faith as the chief form of the Church that allows Suárez to make an easy argument for the diachronic unity of the Church from the beginning of time until the present age.[68] And it is for an identical reason that Suárez's student, Gregory of Valencia, argues that faith is what binds the Church together, for the Old and New Testaments share the same faith in the same Mediator.[69]

Third, both thinkers speak of the unifying principle of the Church in nearly identical language. Such language is important. Suárez often refers to faith as the "chief" (*praecipue*) or "first" (*prima*) form, implying thereby additional forms.[70] Indeed, when speaking of the imperfect life of the *fideles peccatores*, Suárez esteems charity in a manner similar to Aquinas: it is the "proper and perfect life of the Church."[71] Suárez thus emphasizes faith not at the expense of charity, but as the foundation of charity. Faith is the beginning of salvation and thus the least common denominator for Christic-ecclesial union. And even though Suárez's position on faith as the form of the Church proves what Journet calls "a minimal unity of the Church, common to both sinners and the righteous," it still avoids what Journet fears most in such conceptions of "minimal unity," that is, the reduction of spiritual movement only to those things of which the sinner is himself the sufficient principle.[72] For Suárez, it is union with Christ via the mystical body of the Church that enables actual spiritual movement in every member of the faithful—Christ's *influendum in omnia membra*.[73] And since the "vital act"

[68] *De fide* 9.2.3 (*Op.* 12, 254 A): *Ecclesia produci incepit in Adamo, et, formata Eva, proprie dici potuit Ecclesiam esse, atque adeo certum videtur in utroque, saltem post lapsum, ante generationem Cain et Abel fuisse Ecclesiam. . . . Nam Ecclesia est congregatio fideium, ut supra vidimus; sed Adam et Eva in statu innocentiae fuerunt fideles; ergo eorum aggregatio Ecclesia fuit.* See *De fide* 5.6.1 (*Op.* 12, 154A) and Spanedda, "L'ecclesiologia," 40.

[69] Gregory of Valencia, S.J., *Analysis fidei Catholicae* (Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1605), 122: *Alio modo definitur angustius Ecclesia, ut sit hominum multitudo, quos verus Dei cultus, veraque cognitio, sed obscura, nimirum fidei, hac in vita coniungit. Sic Doctores accipiunt, cum asserverant, unam atque eandem esse veteris & novi Testamenti Ecclesiam, ob eandem videlicet fidem in eundem Christum Mediatorem*.

[70] In the 1583 *Lectiones de fide*, 260, Suárez similarly states that union with Christ happens "fundamentally" (*fundamentaliter*) through faith.

[71] See also *De sacramentis,* q. 46, a. 5 (*Op.* 20, 465A): *incorporari Christo . . . tribuitur baptismo, ratione gratiae, et charitatis, per quam homo unitur spiritualiter Christo.*

[72] Journet, *L'Église*, 2:827: *une unité minima de l'Église, commune à la fois aux pécheurs et aux justes*. In criticizing conceptions of minimal unity which focus on *unité de comportement social*, Journet, *L'Église*, 2:827, writes: *nous croyons au contraire que, tant qu'un chrétien pécheur n'est pas schismatique, il y a, de ce fait, plus en lui que ce dont il est lui-même le principe suffisant.*

[73] *De incarnatione*, q. 8, a. 3, no. 2 (*Op.* 17, 641B): *Christus igitur actu habet quidquid ad esse seu constitutionem capitis pertinet, et de se potens est ad influendum in omnia membra*. The example that Suárez uses when speaking of *fideles peccatores* illustrates this point well; see *De fide* 9.1.12 (*Op.* 12, 248B). After admitting that they "participate in some degree of inferior life," Suárez employs the image of a hand lacking the power of sense and motion: *sic manus vi sentiendi et movendi cassa mortua dicitur, quamvis nutriri modo aliquo possit.* According to Suárez, the hand is still somehow nourished

of faith inaugurates this union with Christ, Suárez considers it the first created form of the Church.

Yet charity also plays a unitive role in Suárez's ecclesiology. In his treatise *De charitate*, Suárez argues in a Thomistic vein that charity makes human beings friends of God, and that this friendship is a "total and integral bond."[74] The friendship borne of charity effects unity and "places, so to speak, one soul in two bodies."[75] And this unity is not only between the human being and God, but also between human beings. As Suárez writes in the *De religione*, it belongs to the essence of charity that "it inclines toward God and toward neighbor . . . since love of neighbor is in some way love of God—at least virtually, insofar as God is the reason (*ratio*) of loving one's neighbor." Just as the adoration of an image passes to the prototype, so too "the love of neighbor passes into God." Love of neighbor thus pertains to the perfection of charity and, through charity, to the "perfection of the Christian life,"[76] uniting human beings to God.[77] And just as the power of faith to unite Christians to Christ constitutes faith a *forma Ecclesiae*, so too the power of charity to unite Christians to God and to each other renders it "the proper and perfect life of the Church."[78]

Some modern authors, however, consider this early modern emphasis on a created *forma Ecclesiae* (be it faith or charity) to oppose the teaching of Aquinas, for whom, the argument goes, the Holy Spirit *in person* is the soul or form of the Church.[79] For example, in his discourse on the Apostles' Creed, Aquinas writes that "the soul which vivifies this body [of the Church] is the

(note the passive) despite lacking the power (*vis*) of sense and motion. Suárez attributes this nourishment to Christ when he applies the analogy to *fideles peccatores*, who do not lack all motion because they retain faith, *per quam Christo aliqualiter conjunguntur.* Suárez's position anticipates the much later position of Pius XII in the encyclical *Mystici corporis Christi*, no. 57 (DH §3808): "It is [Christ] who, through his heavenly grace, is the principle of every supernatural act in all parts of the Body. It is he who, while he is personally present and divinely active in all the members, nevertheless in the inferior members acts also through the ministry of the higher members."

[74] *De charitate* 3.2.5 (*Op.* 12, 652B): *[H]aec amicitia inter nos et Deum ex parte hominis est ipsa charitas . . . amicitia inter nos et Deum significat totum integrum vinculum.*

[75] *De charitate* 3.2.4 (*Op.* 12, 65aA): *[A]micitia efficit unum, et velut ponit unam animam in duobus corporibus.*

[76] *De religione* 7.1.4.14 (*Op.* 15, 25A): *Nihilominus absolute dicendum est, amorem proximorum per se pertinere ad vitae christianae perfectionem.*

[77] *De religione* 7.1.4.14 (*Op.* 15, 25A): *. . . una et eadem charitas est quae ad Deum et proximum inclinat. . . . Confirmari ac declarari potest, quia ipsamet dilectio proximi est aliquo modo dilectio Dei, saltem virtualis, quatenus Deus est ratio diligendi proximum; et ideo sicut electio medii est virtualis dilectio finis, vel sicut adoratio imaginis transit in prototypon, ita dilectio proximi transit in Deum, et hac ratione per se pertinet ad perfectionem charitatis, et aliquo modo unit hominem Deo.*

[78] *De fide* 9.1.12 (*Op.* 12, 248B): *. . . charitatis vita, quae est propria et perfecta vita Ecclesiae.*

[79] Soujeole levels this critique against Bellarmine's definition of faith, hope, and charity as the form of the Church. See *Introduction*, 363. On his reading of the tradition and of Aquinas, see 171–75. Soujeole's reading does not take into account the ways in which Bellarmine *does* speak of the

Holy Spirit."[80] Yet George Sabra argues that Aquinas "tends to speak more often in terms of unity in the theological virtues than in that of indwelling."[81] Jean-Pierre Torrell, O.P., concurs with this assessment, adding the rationale that "the Holy Spirit [since it is uncreated] cannot directly fulfill the role of a soul, but he indirectly fulfills it through his gifts [created grace]."[82] Without attempting to resolve this Thomistic dispute, we can at least say that Aquinas describes the unifying principle of the Church in a twofold way: sometimes as the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, other times as the theological virtues. This twofold way of speaking is likewise present in Suárez. As chapter 1 showed, the Holy Spirit immediately (*immediate*) calls, unites, and governs the Church.[83] This twofold way of speaking in Aquinas and Suárez suggests that they recognize the "divine" aspect of the Church in the Person of Christ and the Holy Spirit, but both scholastics understand that the theological virtues (and first among them faith) are the *manifestation and means* of that indwelling: through faith Christ inhabits our hearts. The same can be said of the individual faithful, who indeed receive Christ and the Holy Spirit, yet do so through the gift of the theological virtues.[84] And since Suárez considers the Church to be a moral body inseparable from the individual faithful, it is fitting that he would consider the divine indwelling in the Church in the same manner as the divine indwelling in her members. As Blaise Pascal would put it years later, "all that happens to the Church happens also to each Christian individually."[85]

2.3. Visible Unity, Part I: Being the Church

2.3.1. Introduction

Suárez's strong emphasis on the interior form of the Church makes him susceptible to accusations of a "unilateral" ecclesiology that fails to account sufficiently

Holy Spirit as the soul of the Church: *Ecclesia gubernator a Christo, tanquam a capite & sponso suo, & a Spiritu sancto, tanquam ab anima*, in *De controversiis*, vol. 2, controversy 2, bk. 3, ch. 14, 73B.

[80] Aquinas, *In Symbolum Apostolorum*, a. 9. See also *In III Sent.* d. 13 q. 2 a. 2 qc. 2 ad 1.

[81] Sabra, *Thomas Aquinas' Vision of the Church*, 102.

[82] Jean-Pierre Torrell, O.P., *Saint Thomas Aquinas*, vol. 2: *Spiritual Master*, trans. Robert Royal (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2003), 193.

[83] See chapter 1, section 1.2.3. See also *Defensio fidei* 1.4.9 (*Op.* 24, 16A): *Spiritus autem Sanctus datus est Ecclesiae, ut semper in illa maneat.* Even in the *Defensio* 1.8.15 (*Op.* 24, 41A), however, Suárez continues to call faith a form of the Church: *interiorem formam Ecclesiae, quae est vera fides cum charactere baptismali.* The addition of the baptismal character in this passage will be addressed.

[84] As previously quoted, *De fide* 9.1.3 (*Op.* 12, 245B): *Quia videlicet Ecclesia corpus est Christi, quod ei, ut capiti, debet esse conjunctum; conjungitur autem fide, per quam ipse in cordibus nostris inhabit.*

[85] Blase Pascal, Letter to Mademoiselle de Roannez, no. 9, cited in Henri de Lubac, S.J., *The Motherhood of the Church*, trans. Sr. Sergia Englund, O.C.D. (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1982), 79.

for the Church's visibility, especially as it pertains to the unity and constitution of the Church.[86] Yves Congar writes that Suárez rightly emphasizes the spiritual unity of the Church but fails to account for how this unity is realized "in a visible and social way."[87] Some authors have argued that in his later works Suárez recognized this deficiency and thus developed his earlier, inadequate account of ecclesial unity in favor of a more robust account of ecclesial visibility.[88] For example, Spanedda cites Suárez's 1612 description of the Church as a "congregation of the faithful who in baptism profess their faith and worship God under one sacrifice, head, and sacraments instituted by Christ, and is distinguished from other peoples."[89] Yet Suárez mentions these very elements already in his 1580s description of ecclesial visibility when he is defining the word "Church."[90] That is not to say there is *no* development in Suárez's account of the Church's visible unity, only that such developments cannot be accounted for solely on the basis of a greater emphasis on visibility itself. Indeed, when we examine the rationale behind Suárez's description of the visible unity of the Church, we find impressive consistency throughout his career.[91]

In his 1580s *De Ecclesia*, Suárez asks "whether the true Church is visible" and answers in the affirmative on two accounts. The Church is visible first on account

[86] Lawlor, "Occult Heresy," 544–45, writes that "Suárez's ecclesiology emphasizes in a unilateral way the 'intus' aspect of the Church," a position that ultimately is not "satisfactory." Fenton, "The Status of St. Robert Bellarmine's Teaching about the Membership of Occult Heretics in the Catholic Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 72, no. 3 (March 1950): 213, argues that Suárez's position, which taught that "internal faith was the one actual requisite for membership in the true Church," was "destined, for all intents and purposes, to die with him."

[87] Yves Congar, O.P., "Schisme," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, ed. A. Vacant et al. (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1939), vol. 14, col. 1307. Aiden Nichols, O.P., *Rome and the Eastern Churches: A Study in Schism* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2010), 15, uncritically follows Congar's assessment of Suárez.

[88] Spanedda. "L'ecclesiologia," 41–42, argues that at Coimbra Suárez would feel the need *di completare la definizione di cui prima aveva proclamato la sufficienza*. Spanedda attributes this "completion" to the influence of Bellarmine. Hofmann, "Die Zugehörigkeit," 152–53, speaks of *eine stärkere Berücksichtigung der Sichtbarkeit der Kirche* in Suárez's later works.

[89] See Spanedda, "L'ecclesiologia," 41–42. *De fide* 5.6.1 (*Op.* 12, 154B): *de ratione hujus Ecclesiae est, ut sit congregatio fidelium, qui in Baptismo fidem suam professi sunt, et sub uno sacrificio, capite, et sacramentis a Christo institutis, Deum colit, et ab aliis populis discernitur.*

[90] *De fide* 9.8.3 (*Op.* 12, 273A): *vera Ecclesia, supposita fide quam de illa habemus, discerni et prudenter cognosci in particulari potest . . . quo sensu simpliciter et absolute visibilis dicenda* est; 9.1.3 (*Op.* 12, 245A): *haec Dei Ecclesia est corpus quoddam politicum seu morale, ex hominibus veram fidem Christi profitentibus compositum*; 9.8.6 (*Op.* 12, 274B): *quando adsunt talia signa verae religionis et obedientiae ecclesiasticae, prudenter judicare possumus vere esse membra Ecclesiae.*

[91] Parts of this section first appeared in "At the Fringes of the Church: The Ecclesial Status of Heretics and their Baptized Children in Early Modern Ecclesiology," in *Innovation in Early Modern Catholicism*, ed. Ulrich L. Lehner (London: Routledge, 2021): 111–125.

of the "corporeal and visible persons" who constitute her.[92] Second, the Church is visible on account of her "properties and actions," which manifest her form as external operations manifest the presence of a human soul.[93] Suárez makes an identical claim thirty years later in his *Defensio fidei:* the Church is visible on account of her material cause—she is a "material congregation of men"—as well as on account of her formal cause "although not in itself, but in another . . . [in its] visible or sensible signs and effects."[94] Suárez's account of ecclesial visibility is fundamentally hylomorphic throughout his career: the Church is visible in her material cause and in the actions and effects that signify her formal cause, which are inseparable from her material cause.

In this section and the following, we will examine how Suárez develops his account of the visible unity of the Church on both fronts, the material and the formal. Regarding the former, we will examine Suárez's account of *who* constitutes the Church ("being the Church"). Regarding the latter, we will examine the external actions and institutions—in short, the ecclesial institutions and personal acts of *religio*—which necessarily flow from the *forma Ecclesiae*, faith ("living the Church").

2.3.2. Scalar Conceptions of Membership

As mentioned, Suárez thinks that, having established faith as the first form of the Church, it is "easily gathered" who are the members of the Church: those who possess faith are "in," and those who lack faith are "out."[95] Suárez's approach is primarily concerned with defining the border of ecclesial membership, with presenting *une unité minima.* Such approaches have led scholars to criticize early modern ecclesiology as all-or-nothing, or "nonscalar," in the helpful terminology of Michael Root.[96] This ecclesiology therefore fails, they say, to account adequately for the mysterious nature of ecclesial communion. As Christophe

[92] *De fide* 9.8.1 (*Op.* 12, 272B): *ex personis corporeis et visibilibus.* See chapter 1, section 1.2.1.

[93] *De fide* 9.8.1 (*Op.* 12, 272B): *Catholici autem volunt veram Ecclesiam posse a nobis certo judicio in particulari dignosci, atque adeo esse visibilem . . . veluti . . . anima, visis externis operationibus; habet enim Ecclesia visibiles proprietates et actiones, in quibus et per quas cognosci potest.*

[94] *Defensio fidei* 1.8.8 (*Op.* 24, 39A): *merito potest Ecclesia vera dici visibilis, non solum quoad materialem congregationem hominum, sed etiam quoad internam formam et rationem Ecclesiae, quamvis non in se, sed in alio, ut loqui solent Scholastici, est, quia signa et effectus visibiles, seu sensibiles, quibus conspicitur, sortita est.*

[95] *De fide* 9.1.3 (*Op.* 12, 245B): *Ex dictis vero facile colligitur quae sint vera Ecclesiae membra. . . . [N]imirum omnes qui fidem habent, Ecclesiae membra esse, omnes vero qui illa carent extra Ecclesiam constitui* [*dicendi sunt*]. See chapter 2, section 2.2.1.

[96] Michael Root, "Bishops, Ministry, and the Unity of the Church in Ecumenical Dialogue: Deadlock, Breakthrough, or Both?," *CTSA Proceedings* 62 (2007): 33.

Dumont states, "If it remains true, canonically speaking, that one is necessarily in the Roman Catholic Church or out of it, it is still more true to say, taking the mystery into account, that one is more or less of the Church."[97] Dumont believes that the "Counter Reformation" adopted the former approach because it privileged the notion of the Church as a "hierarchically constituted society" over an "ecclesiology of fellowship" that received pride of place at Vatican II (1962–1965).

We have already demonstrated in chapter 1 how the distinction between "society" and "fellowship" falters when one actually examines the theologians concerned.[98] Yet Dumont's account of early modern ecclesiology falters on another front: namely, the presumption that the societal notion of the Church adopted by early modern theologians prohibits a scalar understanding of ecclesial membership. This is not the case. Despite pretenses to the contrary (*facile colligitur*), the question of ecclesial membership was not answered with ease by anyone who undertook the task. Borders are a messy business. Like someone who sees clear lines of delineation on a map only to find no such striations in reality, early modern theologians may have conceptually differentiated ecclesial member from non-member well enough, but the knowledge of anomalous situations forced the introduction of important distinctions and, occasionally, scalar language to describe the various members of the body of Christ.

Of course, for some theologians, membership remained a strictly nonscalar category. For example, Melchior Cano and Domingo Bañez employ the distinction between "members" and "parts" of the Church precisely because membership is all-or-nothing: a member is living or is not at all. Nevertheless, even here they feel the need to provide the additional category of "parts" in order to account for those who are still in the Church through juridic association or dead faith.[99]

[97] Christophe Dumont, "Concept of Schism," in *Sacramentum Mundi: An Encyclopedia of Theology*, ed. Karl Rahner et al., vol. 6 (New York: Herder and Herder, 1970), 6. Dumont further states, regarding schism, "By defining the Church as a hierarchically constituted *society* under the supreme authority of the Bishop of Rome, and by identifying the Church purely and simply with the Roman Catholic Church, the Counter-Reformation made out schism to be a separation *from the Church* itself." Dumont's framework is adopted more recently by Robert J. Kaslyn, *"Communion with the Church" and the Code of Canon Law: An Analysis of the Foundation and Implication of the Canonical Obligation to Maintain Communion with the Catholic Church* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1994), 160–61. Michael Root, "*Nostra Aetate* and Ecumenism," in *Nostra Aetate: Celebrating 50 Years of the Catholic Church's Dialogue with Jews and Muslims*, ed. Pim Valkenberg and Anthony Cirelli (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2016), 29, writes that "In the area of ecumenism, official Catholic teaching about non-Christian communities prior to Vatican II tended to emphasize nonscalar, all-or-nothing judgments. A community is or is not a church. A person is or is not a member of the church."

[98] Chapter 1, section 1.2.3.

[99] Cano, *De locis theologicis libri duodecim*, bk. 4, p. 217; bk. 4, 273. Bañez, *Comentarios Ineditos a la Tercera Parte de Santo Tomas*, vol. 1, 189; Bañez, *Commentaria in secundam secundae angelici doctoris D. Thomae*, col. 107.

Yet other theologians employ nonscalar (all-or-nothing) categories with scalar (more-or-less) language when speaking of ecclesial membership—a tactic also employed in the documents of Vatican II.[100] Admittedly, their primary purpose is often to establish the nonscalar threshold that distinguishes member from nonmember. Nevertheless, having established a nonscalar threshold, they often employ scalar language to describe ecclesial membership.[101] In other words, having established who is "in" the Church, these thinkers differentiate gradations of members in terms of a "more-or-less" or "perfect-imperfect" scale.[102]

For example, in Bellarmine's discussion of membership in the Church, he distinguishes between three groups: those who are only of the body of the Church (externally professing the faith and sharing in the sacraments while lacking faith and charity), those who are only of the soul of the Church (possessing faith and charity while lacking the external bonds of communion), and those who are "of the body and the soul" of the Church.[103] Persons in this last category are united to Christ both externally and internally and thus are "most perfectly of the Church," thereby implying that the other two categories enjoy a less perfect union. Bellarmine then adds that "even among these [members of the body and of the soul of the Church], some participate more, others less in ecclesial life, and still others only have the beginning of it."[104] He provides the example of *fideles peccatores*, or those with faith and not charity, to prove this point. Thus while Bellarmine argues for a nonscalar threshold for ecclesial membership (the

[100] Michael Root, "*Nostra Aetate*," 29, argues that Vatican II's *Unitatis redintegratio* also employs both nonscalar and scalar categories: "In *Unitatis Redintegratio*, the use of such nonscalar categories is not rejected, but it is supplemented by the use of scalar, more-or-less categories."

[101] While other and more suitable words may be chosen to communicate a scalar notion of union with the Church (such as *Lumen Gentium* 14's preferred term "incorporation" [DH §4137]), the concept of "member" as such does not *prima facie* preclude the possibility of speaking of union with the Church in terms of "degrees." As will be shown, it *can*, but it need not. Indeed, even in the twentieth century, there were debates between those who argued for "degrees of *membership*" and those who opposed such degrees. See James M. Egan, "The Sin of Schism: A Contribution to the Discussion of Membership in the Church," *The Thomist* 27 (1963): 60.

[102] Even Cajetan, *De comparatione,* ch. 22, 14, will speak of *latitudo* in members of the Church *secundum quid*.

[103] Yves Congar, O.P., *Divided Christendom: A Catholic Study of the Problem of Reunion*, trans. M. A. Bousfield (London: The Centenary Press, 1939), 225, has pointed out how difficulties in ascertaining members of the Church informed Bellarmine's ultimately unsatisfying distinction between members "of the body" and "of the soul": "It is only [Bellarmine's] wording that we take exception to, for it is perfectly plain that in some way or other we must make the distinction which it implies and answer the question which it involves."

[104] Bellarmine, *De controversiis*, vol. 2, controversy 2, bk. 3, ch. 2, 54C: *Ex quo fit, ut quidam sint de anima & de corpore Ecclesiae, & proinde uniti Christo capiti interius, & exterius, & tales sunt perfectissime de Ecclesia; sunt enim quasi membra viva in corpore, quamvis etiam inter istos aliqui magis, aliqui minus vitam participent, & aliqui etiam solum initium vitae habeant.*

external criteria), he also admits that within the Church there are some whose union is less perfect (those of the body *or* of the soul) and others whose union is most perfect (those of the body *and* the soul), and he further differentiates this latter group into those who are only beginning ecclesial life, others who participate "less" in it, and still others who participate "more." Bellarmine thus provides not only a nonscalar threshold, but a limited scalar gradation to describe the various members of the Church.

Suárez's analysis of *fideles peccatores* highlights well the scalar element in his understanding of membership. Charity is the "proper and perfect life of the Church," yet persons can lack charity and still be joined to the Church because faith, albeit "dead," still unites us to Christ "in some way." Those with faith and charity thus enjoy a perfect union with Christ and the Church, while those lacking charity enjoy an "imperfect union" with Christ and are thus "imperfect members" (*membra . . . imperfecta*) of the Church. This imperfect membership Suárez describes according to the analogy of a natural body, in which a member may lack "perfect life" and still be a member because "it participates in some grade of inferior life."[105] Having thus established a nonscalar threshold for ecclesial membership (interior faith), Suárez subsequently employs scalar language to describe the various gradations of membership (imperfect-perfect) and participation (inferior-perfect) in ecclesial life. Thus, while Suárez may not develop an explicit conceptual framework of "degrees of membership" and therefore does not extend scalar language to the length which some modern ecclesiologists and even conciliar decrees stretch it, he nevertheless employs scalar language that, in the least, expands the category of membership beyond "all-or-nothing."

For example, Suárez's scalar language allows him to affirm the ecclesial membership of excommunicates and schismatics, all of whom retain the virtue of faith and thus, according to Suárez's undeviating logic, are united to Christ and are members of the Church, even if they participate in ecclesial life only to an inferior degree.[106] But his scalar language does not extend to persons or communities who lack the virtue of supernatural faith altogether. Such persons or communities are simply outside the Church. Nevertheless, Suárez does raise important questions regarding the ecclesial status of certain persons and groups

[105] *De fide* 9.1.12 (*Op.* 12, 248B): *[F]atemur peccatores esse dicendos membra mortua et imperfecta. . . . Sciendum vero in corporibus, quae vita aliqua perfecta vivunt, ut sensitiva, verbi gratia, si membrum talis vitae capax ea careat, simpliciter vocari mortuum, quamvis aliquem inferioris vitae gradum participet; sic manus vi sentiendi et movendi cassa mortua dicitur, quamvis nutriri modo aliquo possit. . . . [P]eccatores ergo quoniam carent charitatis vita, quae est propria et perfecta vita Ecclesiae, dicuntur mortua membra; sunt tamen membra, quia non carent omni motu vitae spiritualis, cum retineant fidem, per quam Christo aliqualiter conjunguntur . . . haec unio imperfecta est.*

[106] Suárez treats these groups in *De fide* 9.1.14 (*Op.* 12, 249A–B). On Suárez's treatment of these groups see also Spanedda, "L'ecclesiologia," ch. 3; Lawlor, "Occult Heretics."

to whom modern ecclesiologists extend scalar language, namely, the Greeks, the baptized children of heretics, and virtuous nonbelievers.[107] In the following sections, we will examine Suárez's treatment of the ecclesial membership of these groups, noting how Suárez's encounter with new sources, information, and problems informs his account of their relationship to the Church. This examination will thus show not only the practical application of Suárez's theory of membership, but also help us to see how practical encounters inform and stretch Suárez's conceptual ecclesiology.

2.3.3. The Greeks

The ecclesial status of the Greek Church became an increasingly pressing question for theologians, and especially Jesuits, in the early modern period for at least three reasons.[108] First there lingered in recent memory the promise and tragedy of the Council of Florence (1431–1449), where a union between East and West had been declared in a bull only to be subsequently rejected by the Orthodox faithful. Second, at least by the late 1580s, Catholic theologians in the West knew of the unsuccessful attempt (1574–1583) by Lutherans at Tübingen to unite with Patriarch Jeremiah II of Constantinople.[109] The question of the Greek Church was thus not entirely unrelated to the pressing question of the Reformations. Third, Jesuit missionaries had settled in the East as early as 1580 and enjoyed varying degrees of *communicatio in sacris* with the Greeks, even preaching in Orthodox churches, serving as confessors to the Orthodox faithful, and establishing a school on Mount Athos in 1635.[110] As Kallistos Ware writes, "Both sides frequently acted as if the schism between east and west did

[107] Root, "*Nostra Aetate*," 29–30, discusses how scalar categories inform Vatican II's *Unitatis Redintegratio* and *Nostra aetate*, in which the Council speaks of the relationship between non-Catholics and non-Christians and the Roman Catholic Church in terms of "more-or-less."

[108] Parts of this section first appeared in DeMeuse, "Spanish Jesuits and the 'Greeks.'"

[109] On the exchange between Jeremiah II and the Lutherans, see Georges Florovsky, "Patriarch Jeremiah II and the Lutheran Divines," *Christianity and Culture* (Belmont, MA: Nordland, 1974), 143–55. Catholic theologians accessed this exchange via the first reply of Jeremiah II, translated and annotated in Kraców in 1582 by the Polish priest Stanislaw Sokolowski and reprinted in Cologne (1583), Paris (1584), and Ingolstadt (1585). Suárez references this work in *De sacramentis* 44.3.1, 7 (*Op.* 20, 810A), as does his confrère, Gabriel Vásquez, S.J., *Commentaria in tertiam partem* (Anwerp: Belleros, 1621), vol. 3, disp. 172, ch. 2, nos. 13–14.

[110] See Georg Hofman, "Rom und Athosklöster," *Orientalia Christiana* 8, no. 28 (1926): 4–39; Marcus Plested, "Latin Monasticism on Mount Athos," in *Mount Athos: Microcosm of the Christian East*, ed. Graham Speake (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2012), 109–11; Kallistos Ware, "Orthodox and Catholics in the Seventeenth Century: Schism or Intercommunion?," in *Schism, Heresy, and Religious Protest* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 259–76.

not exist,"[111] rumors of which the Parisian Parliament must have been aware over a century later when they expelled the Jesuits from France for, among other things, being "favorable to the Greek schism."[112]

The ill-defined relationship between the Jesuits and Greeks in the East was reflected in the variety of theological opinions regarding the Orthodox among Jesuits in the West. For example, St. Robert Bellarmine boldly asserts that "among the Greeks, the Church does not exist."[113] Gabriel Vásquez (1549–1604) liberally applies the label "heretics" to the Greeks for, among other things, their rejection of the efficacy of Latin consecration of unleavened bread and for their denial of the *filioque*.[114] Yet, he also prefers the term "Greek Church" (*Ecclesia Graeca*) to the terms sect, schismatics, or heretics. Luis de Molina (1535–1600) refuses to refer to the Greeks as heretics on account of the *filioque*, deeming the discrepancy in most cases only a manner of speaking,[115] and even avoids the term *schismatics*.[116] It is within such varied discourse on the Greeks that the thought of Suárez inhabits a unique place.

In addition to the reply of Jeremiah II to the Lutherans, Suárez was familiar with a number of other Greek sources including the recently published *Acta Graeca Concilii Florentini* (1577), a defense of the Council of Florence attributed to Gennadius Scholarius, fifteenth-century Patriarch of Constantinople,[117] Mark of Ephesus' *De verbis consecrationis*, and Nicholas Cabasilas' *Explicatio liturgiae*.[118]

[111] Kallistos Ware, *Eustratios Argenti: A Study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2011), 17.

[112] The August 1762 decree cited in P. de Ravignan, S.J., *De l'existence et de l'institut des jésuites* (Paris: Poussielgue-Rusand, 1844), 105: *favorables au schisme des Grecs.*

[113] Bellarmine, *De controversiis*, vol. 2, controversy 2, bk. 4, ch. 8, 90E: *apud Graecos non sit Ecclesia* because they are schismatics, heretics, and defective in apostolic succession of their bishops.

[114] Vásquez, *Commentaria in primam partem*, vol. 2, disp. 146, ch. 1, nos. 2–3.

[115] *Commentaria in primam Divi Thomae partem, in duos Tomos divisa* (Venice: 1602), vol. 1, q. 36, art. 2, disp. 2: "certain Greeks" say that the Holy Spirit proceeds *a solo Patre* and "if [such] do dissent from us in any other way than by words, they err in the faith." This statement is of a different tenor than Vásquez's invective that this error is a *pervulgata haeresis Graecorum* rooted in *magna temeritas* and supported by *frivolis rationibus et fundamentis* (*Commentaria in primam partem*, vol. 2, disp. 146, ch. 1, nos. 2–3; ch. 6, no. 31).

[116] DeMeuse, "Spanish Jesuits and the 'Greeks,'" 142.

[117] In 1733 this *Defensio* would be ascribed to the staunch Byzantine unionist Joseph of Methone (d. 1500), a judgment followed by Migne as well as the twentieth-century editors of Gennadius Scholarius' complete works. See J.-P. Migne's "Monitum Editorum," in PG 159, col. 1107. The work is not listed in Scholarius' complete works: *Georgiu tu Scholariu hapanta ta heuriskomena/Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios*, ed. M. Jugie, L. Petit, and X. A. Siderides, 8 vols. (Paris: Maison de la Bonne, 1928–1936).

[118] DeMeuse, "Spanish Jesuits and the 'Greeks,'" 144–45.

Suárez was also aware of Jesuit missionaries in Greek-speaking territories as well as Greeks traveling through and living in the West.

Throughout his works, Suárez prefers the terms *schismatici* or *Graeca Ecclesia* to refer to the Greeks.[119] Such formulations imply some sort of ecclesial unity between the Greeks and the Catholic Church given Suárez's premise that schismatics remain members of the Church.[120] According to the scholastic schema, a heretic by definition rejects the faith, whereas a mere schismatic retains the faith while rejecting charity. Thus, by using the same logic employed with regard to *fideles peccatores*, Suárez argues that schismatics remain in the Church because "those who retain true faith and are members of Christ, for from him they receive an influx and actuation of the spiritual life, and therefore are [also members] of the Church. For just as the head that is Christ does not have another mystical body besides the Church, so neither [does he have] other members unless those which are members of the Church."[121] Because of Suárez's conflation of Christic and ecclesial union, there is a corollary conflation of "spiritual life" and ecclesial life. Indeed, Suárez argues from the former to the latter: *because* schismatics enjoy a degree of spiritual life in Christ, they are of the Church. In other words, and as argued in chapter 1, wherever the spiritual life in Christ is lived, there, too, is the Church.[122] If the Greeks enjoy this influx, they are members of the Church even if, as we argued in the previous section, this membership is imperfect. Later in his career, Suárez will defend certain distinct, sacramental practices of the Orthodox—such as a baptismal formula that

[119] See, for example, *De sacramentis* 21.1.4 (*Op.* 20, 350B). Suárez rarely concedes the name *Ecclesia* to those outside of the Roman Catholic Church. Occasionally he will refer to the "English Church" (*Ecclesia Anglicana*) and to the "churches of the wicked" (*ab omni ecclesia malignantium*), the latter a clear reference to Psalm 26:5 (*ecclesiam malignantium*), yet the usage is rare and the connotation, in keeping with that of the Psalm, is meant to distance such sects from the *una Ecclesia*. His usage of *Ecclesia* in reference to the Greeks appears much more commonly and with the clear intent to unite. Further, Suárez much prefers the term "sect" (*Anglicana Secta*) in reference to the English, Lutherans, and Calvinists, a designation he does not (as far as I have seen) attribute to the Greeks. See *Defensio fidei* 1.12.13–14, 19 (*Op.* 24, 65A–B, 67B).

[120] Suárez's affirmation of the ecclesial membership of schismatics is distinct in early modernity; nevertheless Aiden Nichols's assertion in *Rome and the Eastern Churches*, 15, that "[f]or nearly all theologians until recent times, schismatics were simply *extra ecclesiam*" is an overstatement. Garrigou-Lagrange, *Christ the Savior*, 317–18; Sabra, *Thomas Aquinas' Vision of the Church,* 179; and Soujeole, *Introduction,* 365–66, all suggest that Aquinas includes schismatics within the Church. The *Cursus Salmanticensis* also followed Suárez on this question; see Ulrich Hörst, O.P., "Die Ekklesiologie des 'Cursus Theologicus Salmanticensis,'" *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 69, no. 1–2 (1974): 65.

[121] *De fide* 9.1.14 (*Op.* 12, 249A): *qui veram fidem retinent, sunt membra Christi, nam ab illo recipiunt influxum et actum spiritualis vitae; ergo et Ecclesiae. Nam sicut Christi caput non habet aliud mysticum corpus praeter Ecclesiam, ita nec membra alia, nisi ea quae sunt membra Ecclesiae.*

[122] Chapter 1, section 1.3.3.

puts the main verb in the passive voice (*baptizetur* rather than *baptizo* as in the Latin West) and consecrating leavened bread—on the basis of the catholicity of the Church, arguing that such practices are legitimate because practiced by the Greeks in "one part of the Church" (*in una parte Ecclesiae*).[123] Suárez even makes allowances for such sacramental differences when Greek and Latin pilgrims travel in each other's lands. We will return to this subject in our discussion of catholicity in chapter 3.

Yet, Suárez adds another qualifier to his inclusion of schismatics in the Church, namely that a schismatic properly speaking "does not deny that there ought to be one, supreme head in the Church, but denies this man individually to be such a head."[124] Here Suárez is considering someone who accepts all the teachings of the Church, including those on the role of the pope, but deems the present pope illegitimate. Later in the same treatise, Suárez states that whether the "one supreme power over the Church" is in one man or in many is the point on which controversy with *heretics* chiefly turns.[125] By such criteria, can the Greeks still be considered mere schismatics? Here, it seems, the argument for their ecclesial status wanes in the opinion of Suárez. In the *De Ecclesia*, Suárez notes in an aside that the Greeks are properly called schismatics, though in reality they are heretics, negating the unity of the head.[126] Indeed, for Suárez, the scope of papal authority is the primary issue with the Greek rejection of the *filioque*, not heretical divergence from the doctrine itself (Suárez, like Molina, thinks that this, in many cases, is only semantics), but a rejection of the Church's doctrine on ecclesial authority, which has resulted in heresy being joined to the schism of the Greeks.[127] He later adds, with a bit more invective, that those who fall away from this head are schismatics and heretics, "especially the Greeks and most especially the Patriarchs of Constantinople, both of whom manifestly, by

[123] DeMeuse, "Spanish Jesuits and the 'Greeks,'" 151–53, citing *De sacramentis* 44.3.9 (*Op.* 20, 811B–12A).

[124] *De fide* 9.1.14 (*Op.* 12, 249A): *nam schismaticus de quo loquimur . . . non negat in Ecclesia unum supremum caput esse debere, sed negat hunc hominem in individuo esse hujusmodi caput; quod sine haeresi potest interdum negari, atque adeo servata fide et unitate Ecclesiae.*

[125] *De fide* 9.6.2 (*Op.* 12, 263A): *Necesse est esse in Ecclesia unam aliquam supremam potestam, ad quam pertinet universalis Christi Ecclesiae regimen. Conclusio est de fide, quam vix ullus hæreticorum negat. Notandum enim est aliud esse dari in Ecclesia potestatem supremam, quæ jurisdictionem habeat, et vim directivam et coactivam in universam Ecclesiam; aliud vero hanc potestem esse in uno homine, aut fortasse in multis; atque controversia cum hæreticis, potissimum versatur de hoc secundo puncto.*

[126] *De fide* 9.1.15 (*Op.* 12, 249B): *ut Graeci proprie dicuntur schismatici, quamvis revera in eo ipso sint hæretici, negantes unitatem capitis.*

[127] DeMeuse, "Spanish Jesuits and the 'Greeks,'" 150. See *De fide* 9.1.15 (*Op.* 12, 249B) and *De SS Trinitatis mysterio*, 10.1.2 (*Op.* 1, 754A): *propter hunc articulum, inter alios, Ecclesia Græca a Latina divisa est, negata obedientia summo pontifici.* In his later Coimbra lectures *De charitate* 12.1.2 (*Op.* 12, 733B), Suárez asserts that *negando Romanum Pontificem esse caput Ecclesiae, nam jam hoc esset schisma conjunctum hæresi.*

the just judgment of God, fell into the hands of the Turks."[128] The Greek Church is thus heretical if and insofar as it negates the idea that the single and supreme head of the Church is the bishop of Rome.

Suárez thus offers a mixed testimony on the ecclesial status of the Greeks, at certain moments they are "schismatics," "the Greek Church," and "one part of the Church," at other moments "heretics." This ambiguity reflects the complex reality of the situation in Suárez's own time. For him, the Greeks stood somewhere between Protestant rebellion and the Church of Rome. And in his attempt to systematize their position in relation to the Catholic Church, Suárez flirts with outright contradiction. The Greeks have fallen into heresy, which means they have lost the faith and, according to his definition, are outside the Church, yet he still refers to them as *Ecclesia* and *una pars Ecclesiae*. The situation was made even more complex by the fact that most of the Greeks were not directly guilty of schism or heresy, a point of which Suárez is acutely aware. Throughout his works, Suárez frequently sequesters errors only to certain Greeks, not wishing to indict the whole Greek Church of heresy.[129] In the final volume of his *De religione*, Suárez will even make a distinction between ecclesiastical judgment on a province and that on a person, writing that in the way in which the "Greeks are considered schismatics . . . the infamy pertains more to the nation than to the person."[130] Just a few sentences before this one, Suárez goes even further by acknowledging that to those raised and educated by heretics, the *sin* of schism and heresy may not apply.[131] This is an important statement for East-West relations. After all, the *De religione* was widely read as, in the words of Joseph Fichter, "the first authority of his age on matters pertaining to religious congregations and practices."[132] This teaching of Suárez likely opened the door to the East in a compelling way, especially for those Jesuit missionaries in the Middle East and Asia of whom Suárez was well aware. Indeed, his knowledge of such missionaries may

[128] *De fide* 10.2.30 (*Op.* 12, 303B): *quotquot ab hoc [sc. Pontifice Romano] capite desciverunt, hæretici et schismatici semper sunt habiti, præcipue græci, maximeque Constantinopolitani patriarchæ, qui manifeste pariter ac justo Dei judicio in manus Turcarum devenere, ex quo per extremam audaciam Romanæ Sedis dignitatem ambiere*.

[129] See, for example, *De sacramentis* 44.3.1 (*Op.* 20, 810A). In addition to the previously mentioned passages where Suárez speaks of the "Greeks" as schismatic or heretical, he does explicitly describe the "whole" Greek Church (*totam illam Ecclesiam*) at *De sacramentis* 21.1.4 (*Op.* 20, 350B), but he does so in order to show the unity of East and West in maintaining the essence of the sacrament of baptism.

[130] *De religione* 10.2.1.14 (*Op.* 16.1, 619B): *si vero notitia vel sententia publica solum est generaliter de tali provincia, vel natione, sicut nunc Graeci habentur schismatici, tunc infamia magis est nationis quam personae, ideoque illa non impediret.* Suárez is speaking here of infamy as an impediment to entrance into the Society of Jesus. The context of this statement will be discussed in section 2.3.4.

[131] *De religione* 10.2.1.14 (*Op.* 16.1, 619A–B).

[132] Fichter, *Man of Spain*, 276.

have prompted him to highlight the Greek Church as an example of the fundamental principle at stake—a reminder, perhaps, that the sin of schism and heresy did not apply to many of the Eastern Christians with whom the missionaries daily engaged.

2.3.4. Ignatius of Loyola, King James I, and the Baptized Children of Heretics

Suárez further develops his distinction between public infamy and personal sin when discussing the culpability of the baptized children of heretics. This question, so crucial to ecclesiology in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries,[133] was rarely addressed in the Christian tradition until the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries,[134] and even then infrequently.[135] The ecclesiological question of the baptized children of heretics is obliquely addressed by Alfonso de Castro, O.F.M. (1495–1558) in his 1547 *De iusta haereticorum punitione*. Therein Castro asks whether a Catholic child (otherwise *innocens*) can be punished for the heresy of his parents.[136] Castro refutes the idea that God never punishes someone for the sins of another, since the biblical witness clearly shows examples to the contrary (2 Sam. 12:13–14; Exod. 20:5–6).[137] Nevertheless, Castro holds that if God punishes a child who imitates the sins of his parents, God punishes that child *properly* for his own sin and *not* for the sin of the parents. The parents may provide an occasion of sin (*occasio peccati*), but the child is guilty on his own account. Castro thus disallows the reduction of culpability in baptized children who sinfully follow their parents into heresy.[138]

[133] For one example, see Johann Baptist Franzelin, *Theses de Ecclesia Christi* (Rome: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S. Congr. De Propaganda fide, 1907), 394. See also Francis A. Sullivan, S.J., *Salvation Outside the Church?: Tracing the History of the Catholic Response* (New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1992), ch. 7 and 8. The importance of this question at Vatican II is particularly manifest in *Unitatis Redintegratio* §3 (DH §4188).

[134] See Sullivan, *Salvation Outside the Church?*, 98.

[135] Otherwise remarkably thorough in his delineation of ecclesial membership, Bellarmine makes no mention of the children baptized and educated in heretical sects in *De Ecclesia militante*. The Spanish Dominican Domingo Bañez likewise offers no explicit comment. See Mario Midali, S.D.B., *Corpus Christi Mysticum apud Dominicum Báñez eiusque fontes* (Rome: Gregoriana, 1962), 206.

[136] Alfonso de Castro, *De iusta haereticorum punitione* (Salamanca: Ioannes Giunta, 1547), bk. 2, ch. 10, fol. 109: *An iustum ut propter haeresim patris filius Catholicus puniatur*.

[137] Castro is also aware of texts such as Ezekiel 18:20: "the son shall not suffer for the iniquity of the father." Indeed, attempts to reconcile Exodus 20:5 and Ezekiel 18:20 appear central to the question of transmitted culpability in early modernity. See also, for example, John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Henry Boveridge (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2008), bk. 2, ch. 8, nos. 19–20.

[138] Castro, *De iusta haereticorum punitione*, bk. 2, ch. 10, fol. 111–12. One of the reasons Castro attributes children's sins of imitation to them *simpliciter* is that failing to do so would render

Francis Sullivan argues that an ecumenical breakthrough on this question first occurs in the theology of the Jesuit Juan de Lugo (1583–1660). According to Sullivan, Lugo's thought is "revolutionary" in proposing that "one who is baptized as an infant by heretics, and is brought up by them in false doctrine, when he reaches adulthood, could for some time not be guilty of sin against the Catholic faith."[139] Sullivan proposes that in this opinion Lugo goes "beyond Suárez" and paves the way for the "modern Catholic position," which could be expressed in the Second Vatican Council's decree *Unitatis redintegratio*:

> [T]he children who are born into . . . [separated] Communities and who grow up believing in Christ cannot be accused of the sin involved in the separation, and the Catholic Church embraces them as brothers with respect and affection. For men who believe in Christ and have been truly baptized are in communion with the Catholic Church even though this communion is imperfect.[140]

Sullivan, however, fails to recognize Lugo's debt to Suárez. Immediately before stating his own position, Lugo actually cites Suárez's Coimbra lectures *De fide*, wherein Suárez states an identical position regarding baptized persons "who are educated among heretics from infancy." Suárez writes that such persons can be "excused from heresy properly speaking" if they have not been sufficiently instructed in the faith,[141] and thus would be considered "invincibly ignorant" for some time (*aliquo tempore*) on account of their upbringing.[142] Lugo thus stands on the shoulders of Suárez, who helps pave the way for the modern position.

divine justice too harsh for the child, who could be culpable for sins committed by those he or she imitates: *Si quis vero concedat etiam hominem puniri pro peccato aliorum, quos imitat: sicut pro peccato paterno, causam suscipiet difficillime sustinendam. Quoniam hoc dato, oportebit etiam concedere, ut si mille homines quis in aliquo scelere imitetur, non solum pro suo peccato: sed etiam pro peccatis omnium illorum, quos in eodem scelere imitatur, sit puniendus. Quod si quis concedere velit, duram certe, & nimis acerbam faciet iustitiam divinam.*

[139] Sullivan, *Salvation Outside the Church?*, 97. Sullivan is quoting Lugo's *Disputationes scholasticae et morales, De virtute fidei divinae* (Lyons: 1656), disp. 20, sect. 2, no. 149, 566–67: *qui in infantia baptizetur apud haereticos, & apud eos in falsa doctrina nutritur, postea factus adultus possit aliquandiu, non peccare contra fidem Catholicam.*

[140] *Unitatis Redintegratio* §3 (DH §4188). See Sullivan, *Salvation Outside the Church?*, ch. 9.

[141] *De fide* 19.5.1 (*Op.* 12, 486A): *Hoc patet manifeste in hominibus baptizatis, qui ab infantia educantur haeretici; illi enim nunquam fuerunt proprie fideles, neque aliquid per infusam fidem crediderunt, aut credere potuerunt sine instructione aliqua; et quamvis ob id a propria haeresi excusari possint, si tamen sufficienter instruantur, eisque catholica doctrina satis proponatur, et nihilominus in prioribus erroribus pertinaces sint, veri haeretici esse incipiunt, et poenas haereticorum incurrunt, quia baptizati supponuntur.*

[142] *De fide* 16.4.5 (*Op.* 12, 416A). Lugo also cites this text.

Despite his misidentification of its harbinger, Sullivan rightly identifies certain causes of this ecclesiological development, pointing to newly acquired knowledge of the "New World" and advances in human psychology as driving concerns.[143] Yet in failing to examine Suárez's position more closely, he overlooks two other causes of this development: Ignatius of Loyola and the Jesuit *Constitutions*, and Suárez's polemics against James I.[144]

In addition to the texts already cited from the *De fide*, Suárez articulates his position on the baptized children of heretics in the *De religione* when discussing obstacles to entering the Society of Jesus. The Jesuit *Constitutions* state that one impediment to admission is "to have separated oneself for a time from the bosom of the Holy Church, by denying the faith in the midst of infidels, or by falling into errors against the faith and having been condemned while in them by a public sentence, or by withdrawing as a schismatic from the unity of the Church."[145] Nevertheless, the *Constitutions* add the qualification that "with respect to schism, if anyone was born in a schismatical region so that the schism was not a particular sin committed only by the person but a general sin, he would not be understood to be excluded from the Society for this cause (and the same holds true of one born in a heretical region)."[146] Ignatius distinguishes here between the personal sins of schism and heresy and "general" sin, attributed to groups and regions, for which certain individuals may not bear culpability. Ignatius is talking about men old enough to enter the Society of Jesus and thus he extends this diminished culpability even into adulthood.

In the *De religione*, Suárez offers a gloss on this text of the *Constitutions*, writing that, especially as it pertains to apostasy,

> if someone were educated from infancy among heretics, even if he had been baptized, and arriving at an adult age, imbibed their errors, it does not seem that he could be said properly and strictly to have departed from the bosom of the Holy Church by denying the faith. This would be more certain when one probably believed that he possessed invincible ignorance.[147]

[143] Sullivan, *Salvation Outside the Church?*, 98. See also Daniel Heider, ed., *Cognitive Psychology in Early Jesuit Scholasticism* (New York: Routledge, 2017).

[144] The *Constitutions* were first published in 1558, two years after the death of Ignatius of Loyola. See *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, trans. Geroge E. Ganss, S.J. (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Resources, 1970), 3. On the composition of the *Constitutions* by Ignatius of Loyola and Juan Alfonso de Polanco, see John O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 6–7.

[145] *Constitutions* §165.

[146] *Constitutions* §167.

[147] *De religione* 10.2.1.14 (*Op.* 16.1, 619A): *Nam si qui ab infantia fuit educatus inter haereticos, etiamsi baptizatus fuerit, et perveniens ad adultam aetatem eorum errores imbiberit, non videtur proprie*

Suárez then adds the passage already cited concerning public judgment on a province or nation, likewise invoking the *Constitutions* and illustrating the principle with the example of the Greek Church.[148] He thus maintains the distinction set in place by the Jesuit founder between personal and general sin, and likewise maintains the possibility of diminished culpability in individuals under general sin, even into adulthood.

Yet, what is the ecclesial status of these baptized children of heretics? Suárez's appeal to "invincible ignorance" fails to answer this question in the positive or the negative.[149] In the *De fide*, Suárez appears reticent to place the children of heretics *properly* in the Church: "they were never faithful properly speaking."[150] Yet, Suárez makes this claim in the context of constructing a situation in which such a child never believed with infused faith because he or she was not properly instructed in the faith,[151] and his overarching point is that people can be considered heretics "in the sight of the Church" (*coram Ecclesia*) even if they were never properly in the Church.[152] What is the status, then, of a child who receives baptism validly administered by heretics, and with it receives infused faith?[153] Does such baptism have the effect of "incorporation into Christ," as the Council of Trent asserts it has when it is properly administered in the context of wholly authentic faith?[154]

et in rigore dici posse a gremio Sanctae Ecclesiae recessisse abnegando fidem. Quod erit certius, quando probabiliter creditur ipsum habuisse ignorantiam invincibilem.

[148] The *Constitutions* do not explicitly invoke the Greeks as an example of the fundamental principle at stake. Suárez contributes this gloss.

[149] As we will see, Suárez elsewhere employs this terminology in order to defend the possibility of nonbelievers belonging to the Church provided certain additional conditions. See also Avery Dulles, S.J., *Church and Society: The McGinley Lectures, 1988–2007* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008), 527; Dulles, *The Assurance of Things Hoped For: A Theology of Christian Faith* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 58–60.

[150] *De fide* 19.5.1 (*Op.* 12, 486A): *illi enim nunquam fuerunt proprie fideles.*

[151] *De fide* 19.5.1 (*Op.* 12, 486A): *neque aliquid per infusam fidem crediderunt, aut credere potuerunt sine instructione aliqua*. As will be discussed, if the baptism was valid, the child did receive infused faith through baptism. See *De sacramentis* 26.2.4 (*Op.* 20, 462B).

[152] Suárez thus appears to be dealing with a question of the external forum here.

[153] Suárez thinks that baptism by heretics can possess the proper intention, form, and matter. *De sacramentis* 13.2.11 (*Op.* 20, 247B): *Et ex hoc patet solutio ad primam confirmationem de sacramento dato ab haeretico; non est enim inconveniens, quod tale sacramentum sit aliquo modo suspectum ex conditione talis personae; et ideo non debet sacramentum ab haeretico suscipi, quoad fieri possit. Nihilominus non est simpliciter dubium tale sacramentum, si nullus alius defectus intercedat, vel timeatur, praeter defectum intentionis, quia haeresis non excludit omnino hanc intentionem sacramenti; potest enim haereticus intendere id facere, quod Christus instituit, ut infra latius dicemus. Quod vero Augustinus ait, intentionem rectam non facere nisi rectam fidem, intelligendum est de rectitudine honestatis meritoriae, et quae ad vitam aeternam conducat.*

[154] Council of Trent, session 21, ch. 4 (DH §1730): . . . *per baptismi lavacrum regenerati et Christo incorporati.*

The *Defensio fidei*, published in 1613 just before the *De fide*,[155] offers insight into this specific question. Concerned with proving that James I is a heretic, Suárez reaffirms his teaching from the *De fide* that James I can be considered a heretic even if he was not properly baptized.[156] Yet Suárez thinks that James I *was* properly baptized, and *therefore* was a member of the Church before his defection. The king claims he was never in the same Church with the Catholics, yet he admits to being baptized in the Catholic rite under the care of his Catholic mother.[157] Suárez concludes:

> [Thus,] he was spiritually begotten into the Catholic Church, not in the synagogue of heretics, because baptism, by which he was regenerated, is the Catholic Church's own proper gift, even though it may be possessed and ministered by heretics, as Augustine says (*De baptismo* 1.10); and the king was then under the power of his most serene mother, who was united to the Catholic Church as a member of it through the faith which she was professing; therefore, the regenerated son, too, is of the Church as a member of it. Nay, even if none of his parents were Catholic, he would be made a member of the Church through baptism rightly administered and not unworthily received, since he received the true righteousness and faith in Christ through baptism at the same time as he received the character of Christ; therefore he had been joined to the Church through the sacrament of faith and through the faith of the sacrament, which is altogether enough to make him a member of the Church.[158]

Suárez draws a fundamental principle from this concrete example:

[155] Suárez points his reader to the *Defensio fidei* at the end of *De fide* 19.5.1 (*Op.* 12, 486A).

[156] *Defensio fidei* 1.24.3 (*Op.* 24, 117B).

[157] In *The Political Works of James I*, ed. Charles Howard McIlwain (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918), 122, James I writes in his "Premonition" (1609), which Suárez had read, "And as for the Queene my Mother of worthy memorie; although she continued in that Religion wherein shee was nourished, yet was she so farre from being superstitious or Iesuited therein, that at my Baptisme (although I was baptized by a Popish Archbishop) she sent him word to forbeare to vse the spettle in my Baptisme; which was obeyed, being indeed a filthy and an apish tricke, rather in scorne then imitation of Christ."

[158] *Defensio fidei* 1.24.2 (*Op.* 24, 117A): *Quod vero rex addit, nunquam in eadem Ecclesia cum Catholicis fuisse. . . . Ipse enim fatetur se fuisse ritu catholico baptizatum, cum adhuc sub cura et potestate serenissimae reginae et catholicae matris existeret; ex his autem principiis manifeste concluditur, ipsum fuisse spiritualiter genitum in Ecclesia Catholica, non in haereticorum synagoga, quia et baptismus, quo fuit regeneratus, est proprium donum Ecclesiae Catholicae, licet interdum ab haereticis possideatur et ministretur, ut ait Augustinus, lib. 1 de Baptismo, cap. 10; et serenissima ipsius mater, sub cujus potestate tunc*

> [T]he same [that he or she is united to Christ as to the head and to the Church as his body] must be thought of an infant, even if baptized by a heretical minister and under heretical parents. For though the ministers or parents may err in private, nevertheless the infant is baptized in the faith of the true Church, and through the same infused faith which he receives in baptism, he is made a member of the Church, even if he be detained under the power of those alien, even hostile, to the Church.[159]

This passage is remarkable for allowing ecclesial membership for those baptized and raised by heretics. Further, Suárez's rationale reveals a development in his own thought. In the 1580s, Suárez downplays the role of baptism for ecclesial unity, rejecting Cajetan's thesis that the baptismal character is the form of the Church because such a character can be separated from faith and thus, according to Suárez, is only a "passive potency" that does not of itself effect the spiritual life in act.[160] Suárez never retracts this position, but in the *Defensio* he more strongly emphasizes baptism as the "proper gift of the Church" and even speaks of baptism and faith in the same breath: "the interior form of the Church, which is true faith *with the baptismal character*."[161] L. Hofmann has noted this development in Suárez's thought, attributing it to a greater emphasis on ecclesial visibility than is evident in Suárez's earlier works.[162] Yet the *Defensio* does not bring visibility

erat rex, unita erat Ecclesiae Catholicae, ut membrum ejus, per fidem quam profitebatur; ergo etiam filius regeneratus est Ecclesiae, tanquam ejusdem membrum. Imo quamvis nullus ex parentibus esst Catholicus, per solum baptismum rite ministratum, et non indigne receptum, factus esset Ecclesiae Catholicae membrum, quia veram justitiam, et fidem Christi per baptismum accepit, simul cum Christi charactere; ergo conjunctus fuit Ecclesiae per sacramentum fidei, et per fidem sacramenti, quod satis omnino est ut fuerit membrum ejus.

[159] *Defensio fidei* 1.24.2 (*Op.* 24, 117A): *ergo idem [sc. uniri Christo ut capite, et Ecclesiae Catholicae ut corpori] sentiendum est de infante, etiamsi a ministro haeretico, et sub parentibus haereticis baptizetur. Quia licet ministri vel parentes errent privato errore, nihilominus baptizatur in fide verae Ecclesiae, et per eamdem fidem, quam in baptismo accipit infusam, membrum ejusdem Ecclesiae efficitur, etiamsi sub potestate alienorum, et hostium Ecclesiae detineatur.*

[160] *De fide* 9.1.22 (*Op.* 12, 252A–B): *Volunt igitur nonnulli baptizatos haereticos omnes esse membra Ecclesiae, atque adeo non fidem, sed characterem esse formam necessariam, et constituentem corpus Ecclesiae. Ita Castro . . . Cajetanus. . . . Nihilominus contraria sententia vera est. . . . Ratio vera est, quia haeretici nullum habent actum vitae spiritualis. . . . Item character non est proprie principium vitae spiritualis, sed signum quoddam, et quasi potentia passiva ad recipienda caetera sacramenta.*

[161] *Defensio fidei* 1.8.15 (*Op.* 24, 41A): *interiorem formam Ecclesiae, quae est vera fides cum charactere baptismali* [emphasis added]. See also *Defensio fidei* 4.10.13–14 (*Op.* 24, 404B–5B).

[162] Hofmann, "Die Zugehörigkeit," 152–53. Hofmann cites Suárez, *De sacramentis*, q. 69, a. 5 (*Op.* 20, 465A). Domingo Bañez, *Commentaria*, col. 107, provides a definition of the Church similar to that of Suárez as a congregation of those possessing faith *and* baptism. However, Bañez explicitly includes baptism to avoid the accusation of an invisible Church: *Quia sacramentum baptismi est*

into this particular discussion, and instead reveals another concern arising from Suárez's engagement with the Anglicans.[163] Suárez wants to prove that James I is a heretic, and he is able to do so best by homing in on the power of the baptismal character joined with faith to effect ecclesial unity. Ironically, Suárez's polemical purpose bears with it the beginnings of an ecumenical position: the possibility of ecclesial membership for those baptized into heretical sects.

Yet when does a person baptized and educated among heretics become culpable of heresy? In his Coimbra lectures, Suárez suggests that these persons are inculpable "for some time" but that "when they are sufficiently instructed [in the true faith], and afterwards persist in their errors, they commit true heresy."[164] He later uses a more processual verb: when they persist in their errors, they *start* (*incipiunt*) to be true heretics.[165] In the *Defensio fidei*, Suárez elaborates further, writing that those who receive "perverse doctrine" within such a sect are not guilty of heresy insofar as they "do not defend such doctrine with pertinacious mind but are solicitous for the truth and ready to correct their error," but he cautions that when the error of the parent can be discerned (*discerni*) by the offspring, the latter can no longer be excused of culpability.[166] Suárez is using processual, psychological language to define the bounds of ecclesial membership, a position employed by later thinkers like Lugo and the Jansenist Jan Opstraet (1651–1720).[167] Suárez never invokes a slightly more objective age of reason.

professio fidei Evangelicae & Christianae religionis. Unde nostra ecclesia visibilis, si proprie loquamur, non conficitur ex iis, qui tantum habent fidem, sed ex iis qui profitentur fidem, quam habent.

[163] During Suárez's polemics with James I, the term "Anglican" with the confessional attributes it came to be associated with is only in the early stages of development. My use of the term here and throughout is not meant as an anachronism, but only to express something slightly more that just "the Church *in* England" (for the Church of Rome was still *in* England) but slightly less than developed confessional Anglicanism that would arise in the coming decades and centuries in England. See Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

[164] *De fide* 16.4.5 (*Op.* 12, 416A): *. . . et licet aliquo tempore excusari possint a peccato per ignorantiam invincibilem, tamen, quando postea sufficienter instruuntur, et in suis erroribus permanent, veram haeresim committunt.*

[165] *De fide* 19.5.1 (*Op.* 12, 486A): *veri haeretici esse incipiunt.*

[166] *Defensio fidei* 1.24.1 (*Op.* 24, p. 116B–17A): *Relegat, quaeso, sententiam Augustini paulo antea citatem, ex Epist. 162, ubi loquens in specie de illis qui falsam et perversam credunt doctrinam, quam non audacia sua pepererunt, sed a seductis, atque in errorem lapsis parentibus acceperunt, tunc solum eos inter haereticos non deputat, quando non pertinaci animo talem doctrinam defendunt, sed de veritate solliciti, parati sunt errorem corrigere. E contrario vero in aliis lociis sine ulla distinctione, ut haereticum damnat pertinacem in errore, sive illum per se invenerit, sive a falso doctore, sive a parente didicerit. Quod etiam ratio ipsa manifeste ostendit, nam parentis error, quando jam a prole discerni potest, ipsius culpam non excusat, quin potius accusat.*

[167] Lugo, *De virturte fidei divinae*, disp. 20, sect. 2, no. 149, 567, states that in order for someone to be deemed a heretic, the Catholic faith must have been proposed *sufficienter.* Jan Opstraet, *De Ecclesia*, in *De locis theologicis dissertationes decem* (Venice: Balleioniana, 1769), *De Ecclesia,* q. 1, dis. 3, no. 9,

For him, the border of the Church is a personal condition that requires not only objective criteria (baptism) but also subjective conditions (faith).[168]

2.3.5. Jesuit Missions and the Salvation of Nonbelievers

The processual, psychological conditions of ecclesial membership become most pronounced in Suárez's treatment of the salvation of virtuous nonbelievers who have never heard the gospel. Much has been written on Suárez's thought on this question.[169] In this section, we will look specifically at how Suárez delineates the ecclesial status of such persons, focusing on his treatises *De fide* and *De legibus.*

Suárez had read Francisco de Vitoria's (1483–1586) *Relectio de Indis* and was well aware of the difficulties Catholic missionaries faced in the New World and other lands, particularly in Asia.[170] Whether nonbelievers who had never heard the gospel could be saved and, if so, whether they were incorporated into the Church had become two of the dominant theological questions of the day. The ordering of these questions is important, especially for Suárez: the soteriological imperative drives the ecclesiological imperative.[171] As we argued in chapter 1, Suárez's position that outside the Church there is no Christian life can also be read inclusively: wherever the Christian life is lived, there, too, is the Church.[172] This is precisely how Suárez answers the question of the ecclesial membership

126, writes that it is difficult to ascertain when someone raised by heretics or schismatics shares in the sin "with their own will": *Neque certa regula statui potest, quandonam censendi sint propria voluntate haeresi aut schismati communicare: nam alii serius, alii citius, ad usum rationis perveniunt: alii plus, alii minus valent ingenii vivacitate, ut possint Ecclesiam Catholicam inter haereticas aut schismaticas societates discernere: alii plus, alii minus, de Ecclesia Catholica audiunt, legunt, instruuntur, &c.*

[168] Suárez thus accounts far more for "the subjective reception of objective truth" than his English translator, Peter L. P. Simpson, allows. See Suárez, *Defense of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith against the Errors of Anglicanism*, trans. Peter L. P. Simpson (New York: Lucairos Occasio Press, 2012/2013), 10.

[169] See, among others, Dulles, *Church and Society*, 527; Dulles, *The Assurance of Things Hoped For*, 58–60; Robert Fastiggi, "Francisco Suárez and the Non-Believers," *Pensamiento* 74 (2018): 263–70; Sullivan, *Salvation Outside the Church?*, 91–94; John P. Doyle, "Francisco Suárez: On Preaching the Gospel to People like the American Indians," *Fordham International Law Journal* 15, no. 4 (1991): 879–951.

[170] Ilaria Morali, "The Early Modern Period (1453–1650)," in *Catholic Engagement with World Religions*, ed. Karl J. Becker and Ilaria Morali (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010), 81; Doyle, "Francisco Suárez," 918–19. See also *De fide* 17.1.6 (*Op.* 12, 425B), where Suárez mentions those who have heard of the faith through preaching, such as the "Turks and Saracens, and in the provinces of India."

[171] See, for example, *De fide* 12.4 (*Op.* 12, 350B–60A).

[172] Chapter 1, section 1.3.3.

of nonbelievers. He first asks whether it is possible for them to believe, to live the Christian life, and therefore to be saved, and only then asks how they are incorporated into the Church on account of this believing and living.

While discussing Christ's headship in his *De incarnatione* (1590), Suárez hints at the process by which a nonbeliever arrives at true faith and ecclesial membership. As discussed, Suárez follows St. Thomas by including the blessed, the charitable, and the faithful as *actual* members of Christ. He then lists *potential* members: the predestined not yet united to Christ and the non-predestined. Suárez proceeds to elaborate on the text of Aquinas, writing that Christ has influence over all the members of the body and even those separated or not yet united to him:

> Christ even has some influence on those who are members [of Him] only in potency, in sending them some illuminations or inspirations, in order that, little by little, he might draw them to faith in, and love of, him. Indeed, this head is so efficacious that he can act in a separated member, or one only in potency, in order to join such a one at last to Himself.[173]

Suárez elaborates on this process of nonbelievers accepting the faith in his Coimbra lectures *De fide.* Before the faith is sufficiently proposed to a nonbeliever, that person has the obligation of "hearing, inquiring, and learning about the faith." Suárez describes this process in detail. Everyone has faults. The journey to faith commences when a person begins to feel remorse of conscience concerning his faults. This feeling of remorse obliges the person to correct his error, which leads to an inquiry after the truth. Through inquiring after the truth, the nonbeliever will be enlightened, either exteriorly by people or interiorly by inspirations, thereby recognizing more of his faults, which obliges him "more and more" to inquire after the truth and "do what lies within him" until he "finally arrives at a sufficient proposal of the faith."[174] If the faith is never sufficiently proposed, a person can still be saved because, on account of invincible

[173] *De incarnatione,* q. 8, a. 3, no. 4 (*Op.* 17, 641B): *Interdum etiam habet aliquam influentiam in eos qui tantum sunt membra in potentia, in mittendo aliquas illustrationes, seu inspirationes, ut eos paulatim ad suam fidem et amorem trahat; est enim hoc caput ita efficax, ut possit agere in membrum separatum, seu in potentia tantum, ut illud sibi tandem conjungat.*

[174] *De fide* 12.1.9 (*Op.* 12, 364A): *si sit homo infidelis qui in erroribus contra lumen naturale detinetur, incipiet remorsum conscientiae sentire circa ipsosmet errores, et tunc incipiet obligari ad quaerendam veritatem in illa materia; et tunc si cum divino auxilio fecerit quod in se est, paulatim magis ac magis illuminabitur, atque ita etiam magis ac magis obligabitur ad inquirendam veritatem, donec ad sufficientem fidei propositionem perveniat. Et hic videtur esse ordinarius modus in hominibus fide carentibus.*

ignorance, he can at least possess *implicit* faith in Christ. Yet if the faith has been *sufficiently* proposed, an admittedly subjective criterion which seeks to guard against the possible abuses and ulterior motives of missionaries,[175] the obligation to make an act of faith arises. In some ways, this is a very natural process of conversion: the human person encounters the gospel in a sensory manner, feels guilt, pursues an intellectual quest for truth, etc. Yet, the acceptance of faith is always a supernatural event, and thus Suárez cautions that even the act of hearing, inquiring, and learning is most of all (*maxime*) a supernatural movement, a gift that cannot occur until God begins to illumine and incite the person by his grace. Then, "the obligation [of hearing, inquiring into, and learning the faith] arises little by little according to the mode of inspiration and the condition or necessity of the person."[176] And since, according to Suárez's ecclesiology, the reception of faith is the beginning of membership in the Church, this gradual illumination into faith (either implicit or explicit) is also the subtle *convocatio* to the Church, a call and response between the liberating force of the divine summons (often working through the gospel's human representative) and the natural aptitudes of the human person.

Yet, as I have indicated, in his later works Suárez begins to emphasize more strongly the role of baptism as the door of the Church, including it with faith as the *sine qua non* of ecclesial membership. To what degree, then, are nonbelievers obliged to be baptized, even those who have never heard the gospel? Suárez treats this question in the part of his *De legibus* on the promulgation of the new law, a topic that has direct import for missionaries. According to Aquinas and Suárez, one of the essential features of any law is that it be promulgated (*promulgata*).[177] The necessity of promulgation arises from the notion that the obligation of law follows upon sufficient knowledge of that law; if a community, through no fault of its own, does not know the law, it cannot be bound by that law. For Suárez, such promulgation is typically an external, sensible, and public pronouncement—either written or oral—which has the authority to bind the community to which it is addressed.[178] God could promulgate the divine law

[175] Doyle, "Francisco Suárez," 912.

[176] *De fide* 12.1.9 (*Op.* 12, 363B–64A): *Unde fateor hanc obligationem [sc. obligatio audiendi, inquirendi, seu addiscendi ipsam fidem] esse maxime supernaturalem, et non posse in homine inchoari, seu illi applicari, donec Deus sua gratia incipiat illuminare et excitare hominem, sive exterius per hominem, sive interius per suas inspirationes; posita autem hac inspiratione, paulatim insurgit ista obligatio, juxta modum inspirationis, et conditionem, seu necessitatem hominis.*

[177] Aquinas, *ST* I-II, q. 90, a. 4: [*Definitio legis est*] *quaedam rationis ordinatio ad bonum commune, ab eo qui curam communitatis habet, promulgata.* See Suárez, *De legibus* 1.11 (*Op.* 5, 49B–52B).

[178] *De legibus* 1.11.6 (*Op.* 5, 51A): *Nunc ergo in genere sufficiat necessariam esse aliquam propositionem externam et sensibilem factam ita publice, et cum tanta temporis latitudine, ut moraliter possit ad notitiam totius communitatis devenire, quia hoc saltem necessarium est ut obligare possit, quod per se ad legem spectat.*

privately and interiorly according to his absolute power (*de potentia absoluta*), giving a private revelation to those who have never heard the gospel. But this is not God's typical way of proceeding. When God blesses his creatures, God does so in the mode of the creature, not violating nature but affirming and elevating it.[179] Thus, the divine law, like positive, human law, must be externally and publicly promulgated to a community in order to bind it.[180] And since baptism is the "door" to the new law, baptism must also be proclaimed to the nations, as commanded by Christ in the Gospel of Matthew.[181] The work of missionaries is thus essential to the fulfillment of the gospel mandate, because that work is part of the way in which Christ wants his precepts promulgated in his new law. We will return to this idea in chapter 3.

Because of the necessity of promulgation *in modo hominis*, Suárez argues that the necessity of baptism for salvation, and thus for ecclesial membership, began to oblige the world only gradually, since promulgation could not be diffused throughout the world all at once.[182] Thus, on the day of Pentecost, the necessity of baptism commenced, and "those who were baptized were made members of the Church of Christ and subject to Peter."[183] Before that day, however, not baptism, but only implicit or explicit faith in Christ was necessary for salvation.[184] Even on the day of Pentecost, the promulgation of the obligation to be baptized

[179] *De legibus* 1.11.6 (*Op.* 5, 51B): *non est ita necessaria in legibus Dei de potentia absoluta, quin possit ipse tanquam supremus dominus obligare omnes per privatam notitiam etiam mere interiorem: ille autem modus non esset hominibus accomodatus, et praesertim pro multitudine seu communitate humana.* See also *De fide* 12.4.11 (*Op.* 12, 354A) and *De legibus* 10.4.9 (*Op.* 6, 569B): *Propriissime autem necessaria est promulgatio in lege positiva, non quia est humana vel divina, sed quia hominibus datur, et secundum ordinariam providentiam debet modo hominibus accommodato illos obligare.*

[180] *De legibus* 10.4.2 (*Op.* 6, 566B): *Suppono ut certum hanc legem, ex intentione Dei et Christi, latam esse pro universis hominibus viatoribus, quod est de fide certum.*

[181] *De legibus* 10.1.6 (*Op.* 6, 551B): *Ac generaliter de tota sua lege, et specialiter de Baptismo tanquam de janua ejus, dixit Matth. ult.: Euntes docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti.*

[182] The promulgation of baptism is typically joined with the promulgation of the New Law, since according to *De legibus* 10.4.23 (*Op.* 6, 574A), *Baptismus sit reliquorum [praeceptorum legis novae] fundamentum.*

[183] *De legibus* 10.4.13 (*Op.* 6, 570B): *Addo legem novam coepisse obligare in die Pentecostes. . . . Tunc ergo coepit Baptismus obligare, et esse necessarius ad remissionem peccatorum, et qui baptizabantur fiebant membra Ecclesiae Christi Petro subjecta.*

[184] Suárez refutes the idea that the Jews under the Old Law were immediately obligated to follow the New Law and to be baptized on the day of Christ's passion. Such an obligation would have been a "great harm to all the infants who at that time were being circumcised in a holy and legitimate rite" (*De legibus* 9.22.3 [*Op.* 6, 547A]). Likewise in his *De mysteriis vitae Christi*, q. 46, a. 11 (*Op.* 19, 578B–79A), Suárez uses the same logic to sidestep the disagreement between Cyprian and Augustine over whether the good thief on the cross was baptized by blood (as a martyr) or by water (flowing from the side of Christ): *Verum non oportebat esse sollicitos, quia tunc necessitas baptismi nondum urgebat* (*Op.* 19, 579A).

was not universal, but began to oblige the Jews only in Jerusalem at that time, and "after a succession of time the obligation was diffused throughout all of Judea, Samaria, and other provinces."[185] Likewise for the Gentiles, the obligation of baptism did not begin until the revelation made to Peter in Acts 10, and only after that did it gradually bind the rest of the world in direct proportion to the preaching of the gospel.[186] For Suárez, the promulgation of the New Law is not only a conceptual theory, but a missional necessity of the Church worked out in time and space.

At this point Suárez asks a question that bears particular relevance for our discussion of the necessity of baptism for those who have never heard the gospel: is baptism yet obligatory for the whole world, since the gospel has not yet been promulgated to the ends of the earth?[187] Suárez responds by distinguishing between "promulgation" and "diffusion." He argues via Romans 10:18 that the gospel was sufficiently *promulgated* by the Apostles on the day of Pentecost and shortly thereafter. Nevertheless, "it can happen that knowledge of the gospel for a long time either did not reach many provinces of the world altogether, or at least did not reach them sufficiently."[188] If a legislator promulgates a law, then a sufficient amount of time must be allotted for the diffusion (*divulgatio*) of the law throughout the kingdom before it universally obliges.[189] Properly speaking, a sufficient amount of time has indeed passed for the New Law to oblige the whole world. Nevertheless, "the *diffusion* or knowledge [of a law] can be impeded, which does not impede the obligation [which flows from promulgation], although an excuse can arise. And thus, I concede that many nations could be excused for a long time from transgressing this law, since although the law already and of itself obligates them, ignorance could excuse them from fault." Suárez, however, adds

[185] *De legibus* 10.4.15 (*Op.* 6, 571A): *verius censeo hanc legem non simul obligasse Judaeos ubique existentes, sed incoepisse tunc obligare, et postea successu temporis obligationem fuisse diffusam per totam Judaeam, Samariam, et alias provincias.*

[186] *De legibus* 10.4.24 (*Op.* 6, 574A–B): *constat legem novam non incoepisse obligare Gentiles per se ac proprie usque ad revalationem Petro factam, Actor. 10. . . . [Inferatur] ex eo tempore quo facta est Petro dicta revelatio, coepisse Apostolos libere praedicare Evangelium gentibus, ipsosque Gentiles coepisse per hanc legem obligari, non tamen fuisse obligatum totum orbem, sed successive, prout Evangelium promulgabatur.*

[187] *De legibus* 10.4.24 (*Op.* 6, 574B): *videtur sequi ex dictis etiam nunc non obligare legem gratiae totum universum quia nec . . . promulgatum est Evangelium in toto mundo . . . ac denique in nostro tempore videtur hoc experientia compertum esse; ergo per omnia haec tempora lex nova non obligavit totum mundum.*

[188] *De legibus* 10.4.25 (*Op.* 6, 574B–75A): *Respondetur distinguendam esse promulgationem a divulgatione seu notitia promulgationis. Nam promulgatio sufficienter facta est ab Apostolis in die Pentecostes et deinceps. . . . Fieri auten potuit ut haec notitia Evangelii per multum tempus vel omnino non pervenerit ad multas mundi provincias, vel saltem non sufficienter.*

[189] *De legibus* 10.4.25 (*Op.* 6, 575A): *Per se enim promulgatio publica cum tempore sufficiente ad integram divulgationem est necessaria ad integram obligationem.*

that "ignorance cannot impede the necessity of baptism, for the law works this effect through itself and independently of the knowledge of the subjects."[190]

Suárez's testimony bears witness to the difficulty faced by early modern theologians in maintaining the necessity of baptism for those who have not yet heard the gospel. On the one hand, the obligation to be baptized is only gradually imposed on the whole world after the day of Pentecost. On the other, the necessity of baptism now sufficiently obliges the whole world such that even invincible ignorance cannot remove such an obligation from a nonbeliever (even if invincible ignorance can reduce the culpability of one who is not baptized). Suárez reconciles these two theses in his *De fide* when he discusses the obligation of baptism for those to whom the gospel has not been sufficiently preached, and thus for whom diffusion has been impeded. As mentioned, in such a case a person can still be saved through *implicit* faith in Christ, but with it must be an *implicit* desire for baptism. Suárez writes, "No one can be saved unless he enters the Church of Christ either *in re* or at least *in voto* and by desire. . . . Since no one is truly (*in re*) in this Church unless he is baptized, and yet such a person [to whom the gospel has not been sufficiently preached] can be saved, because just as the desire of baptism suffices for him or her, so too does the desire of entering the Church."[191] Suárez goes on to say that this desire for entering the Church can also be *implicit*, and that such an implicit desire suffices with respect to baptism and entrance into the Church. Here again, the soteriological imperative drives Suárez's understanding of ecclesial membership: if such a person can receive Christ and be saved, then such a person must somehow be able to enter the Church, even if only by implicit desire. The presence of Christ bears with it the presence of his mystical body, the Church.

Suárez's Christic-ecclesial conception of unity rooted in the gift of faith received in baptism permeates his treatment of the ecclesial status of the Greeks, the baptized children of heretics, and those who have never heard the gospel. Nevertheless, Suárez's encounter with these anomalous situations, coupled with his understanding of human psychology, tested the limits of his ecclesiological categories.[192] The case of the Greeks being called both heretics and "one part of

[190] *De legibus* 10.4.25 (*Op.* 6, 575A): *Potest illa divulgatio aut notitia impediri, inde tamen non impedietur obligatio, quamvis oriri possit excusatio. Et ita concedo potuisse plures gentes excusari multo tempore a transgressione hujus legis, quia licet lex de se jam eos obligaret, ignorantia poterat a culpa excusare. Non tamen potuit ignorantia impedire necessitatem Baptismi . . . nam hunc effectum lex per seipsam operatur independenter a notitia subditorum.*

[191] *De fide* 12.4.22 (*Op.* 12, 359A): *Ita enim nemo salvari potest, nisi hanc Christi Ecclesiam vel in re, vel in voto saltem et desiderio ingrediatur. . . . [Q]uia nullus est in re ipsa intra hanc Ecclesiam, nisi baptizatus sit, et tamen salvari potest, quia sicut illi sufficit votum baptismi, ita etiam votum ingrediendi Ecclesiam.*

[192] Sullivan, *Salvation Outside the Church?*, 98, puts it best when he writes that "What we find in these Catholic theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is an openness to truth from

the Church" challenges Suárez's insistence on interior faith as the *sine qua non* of ecclesial membership. The case of the baptized children of heretics belonging to the Church at baptism and yet losing this membership at some point in their development, possibly before the adherence to formal heresy, indicates a limit in how far Suárez's scalar understanding of membership extends. And the fact that virtuous nonbelievers can belong to the Church yet remain unknown to the other members of the Church suggests that while the Church's members are always visible,[193] they are not always visible *as members* of the Church. Thus, Suárez's ecclesiology suggests that membership in the Church is not as "easily gathered" as he suggests in the *De Ecclesia*, since the determination of which human pilgrims are indeed members of the Church bears certain difficulties that can hardly be resolved in the external forum alone.[194] The reality of the Church as a Christic way of life and personal condition remains central to Suárez's conception of the visible unity of the Church.

2.4. Visible Unity, Part II: Living the Church

2.4.1. Introduction

Suárez's defense of the visibility of the Church in material terms—that is, the Church is visible because she is composed of human beings—still does not fully absolve him from the charge of advocating an "invisible Church." After all, as the previous section indicated, it is not always clear who are the members of the Church, even granting Suárez's later emphasis on baptism. Who among baptized Greek, Lutheran, or Anglican children have discerned the error of their parents? Which pagans have implicitly desired baptism? How can a person seek the Church for salvation if that Church is visible *only* in her members, and those members are constituted *only* by the baptismal character and a form invisible to the eyes?[195] Indeed, Suárez will even admit in the *Defensio fidei* that, with

whatever source it came to them, and a readiness to reexamine traditional ideas and assumptions in the light of newly acquired human knowledge."

[193] In the words of Soujeole, *Introduction*, 367: "The life of the ecclesial community does not exist 'in itself'; it is rather the life of each member—beginning with Christ—and of all the members in their mutual relations."

[194] Indeed, distinguishing between the "internal" and "external" forum would be precisely how Suárez's distant successor Johann Baptist Franzelin (1816–1886), *Theses de Ecclesia Christi* (Rome: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S. Congr. De Propaganda fide, 1907), 394–96, would attempt to answer similar ecclesiological questions. Franzelin relies in this section on Lugo, who, as previously argued, relies on Suárez.

[195] *De fide* 9.1.19 (*Op.* 12, 251A): *invisibilem formam*; *Defensio fidei* 1.8.8 (*Op*. 24, 39A).

regard to her sanctity and spiritual gifts, the whole Church is "per se invisible"![196] Bellarmine sought to avoid this danger by outlining purely external criteria for membership and by criticizing those Protestants who "require internal virtues to constitute someone a member of the Church, and on account of this make the true Church invisible."[197] How does Suárez (if at all) avoid such a criticism?

In this section, we will examine the second form of ecclesial visibility according to Suárez, the *formal* visibility of the Church that consists not in the visibility of the form itself, but in the visible properties, actions, signs, and effects that flow forth from that invisible form, faith. In chapter 1 (section 1.3.2), we outlined Suárez's threefold rationale behind his account of visible faith and *religio*—the hylomorphic, social, and incarnational—and hinted at how this account pertains to the Church. We will now follow this same outline—hylomorphic, social, and incarnational—as we exposit the rationale behind Suárez's argument for the second type of ecclesial visibility.

2.4.2. More or Less Manifestation: A Hylomorphic Account of Visible Unity

According to Suárez, faith is never purely speculative. As he states at the beginning of the *De religione*, faith is "simultaneously and eminently speculative and practical: speculative in that it reveals God to be, and to be worthy of all honor; practical insofar as it teaches the manner and obligation of worshipping him."[198] Thus, as argued in chapter 1, faith directly effects and ignites *religio,* or the care and ceremony offered to God. And again, this *religio* is not merely internal, but is expressed "by exhibiting some sensible signs of it, through which signs [the worshipper] satisfies his interior affect and in which signs his affect is confirmed and increased."[199] So, too, with faith. In his Coimbra lectures *De fide*, Suárez

[196] *Defensio fidei* 1.8.18 (*Op.* 24, 42B): *Et hoc modo etiam tota Ecclesia potest dici regnum Dei, et civitas Dei viventis, et domus spiritualis, et per se invisibilis, quantum ad sanctitatem, et spiritualia dona, et nihilominus esse visibilis quoad personas in quibus existit.* Suárez is here expositing Luke 17:21: *Ecce enim regnum Dei intra vos est.*

[197] Bellarmine, *De controversiis*, vol. 2, controversy 2, bk. 3, ch. 2, 53E: *omnes aliae* [*sententiae*] *requirunt internas virtutes ad constituendum aliquem in Ecclesia, & propterea Ecclesiam veram invisibilem faciunt.*

[198] *De religione* 1.1.2.2 (*Op.* 13, 7A): *Est enim fides simul et eminenter speculativa et practica: speculativa quidem, ostendens Deum esse, et dignus esse omni honore; practica vero, quatenus etiam docet modum et obligationem colendi illum.*

[199] *De religione* 2.1.1.9 (*Op.* 13, 80B): *Quia sicut intelligit spiritualia per sensibilia, et ad modum rerum corporalium, ita vix exprimit interiorem reverentiam et submissionem, nisi exhibendo aliqua sensibilia signa illius, per quae et suo affectui quodammodo satisfacit, et rursus per eadem in illo interiori affectu confirmatur et crescit.*

writes that the act of faith is twofold: interior and "exterior, consisting in the confession of faith."[200] For Suárez, faith *necessarily* manifests itself as a form is manifest in external operations. In the *Defensio fidei*, Suárez uses the image of a horse or a human, whose substantial form or soul is visible through the operations of the body.[201] The faith of the Church is visible through the external operation of the confession of faith and through external acts of *religio*.

The confession of faith is not always or even necessarily a verbal profession of the creed. Suárez writes in his Coimbra lectures that "this confession of faith can occur all the same by words or by external things or actions . . . since the mind (*mens*) is manifest not only by words but also by things and actions."[202] Suárez elaborates that while we confess the faith when we orally profess the creed, we also confess the faith when we "adore Christ exteriorly, or hear the Mass, and likewise when we carry a rosary or something similar, we show our faith."[203] We thus confess the faith through acts of *religio* instituted by Christ and his Church, and particularly in our charity toward others and in offering sacrifice to God. Suárez adds, however, that while some of these actions *materially* confess the faith, that is, they are actions that are *per se* expressions of another virtue (such as *religio*) but are taken up by the faithful as an expression of internal faith,[204] we *formally* confess the faith when our words or actions, through themselves and out of direct intention, express interior faith.[205] The primary, formal confession of faith, then, is in the sacrament of baptism.[206] And although baptized children and adolescents may not yet exhibit their faith through their own act, they nevertheless receive that faith through baptism and its associated external acts of faith, and throughout their lives they are obliged to "prove themselves catholic and faithful to all those among whom they live" by showing their faith through such external acts.[207]

[200] *De fide* 13 (*Op.* 12, 360B): *Est autem actus fidei, scilicet interior, qui partim est in intellectu, et est assensus rerum fidei; partim in voluntate, et est voluntas credendi. Alter actus est exterior, in confessione fidei consistens.*

[201] *Defensio fidei* 1.8.8 (*Op.* 24, 39A).

[202] *De fide* 14.2.2 (*Op.* 12, 385A): *adverto imprimis hanc fidei confessionem fieri posse tum verbis, tum etiam rebus et actionibus externis . . . quia non solum verbis, sed etiam rebus et actionibus mens manifestatur.* See also Suárez's treatment of this matter in more general terms in his 1583 *Lectiones de fide*, 245–49.

[203] *De fide* 14.2.2 (*Op.* 12, 385A): *confitemur ergo fidem, quando symbolum fidei ore proferimus, et quando Christum exterius adoramus, vel missam audimus; item portando rosarium, vel aliquid simile fidem nostram ostendimus.*

[204] In *De fide* 14.2.2 (*Op.* 12, 385A–B), Suárez defines action that confesses the faith materially as action *quae fit intuitu alterius virtutis, re ipsa tamen et ex se continet externam significationem fidei internae, ut verbi gratia, sacrificare Deo, per se actus est religionis; quatenus vero a fideli fit ritu a Christo instituto, est quaedam professio Christi, et ita est confessio quaedam fidei, materialis tamen.*

[205] *De fide* 14.2.2 (*Op.* 12, 385A–B).

[206] *De fide* 14.2.2 (*Op.* 12, 385B–86B).

[207] *De fide* 14.2.7 (*Op.* 12, 386B): *Qui autem ante aetatem adultam baptismum receperunt, quia jam non possunt per illum tanquam per proprium actum ostendere fidem suam (non enim possunt illum iterum*

This description of the visibility of faith remains consistent with Suárez's position in his much earlier *De Ecclesia*. Responding to the position of the "heretics" that nothing visible and external is required for members of the Church, Suárez writes:

> Although true faith is interior, nevertheless it can be seen in some way though external signs; therefore, although the form itself by which the members of the Church are united interiorly among themselves is not seen, it is seen at least in its signs, and this is sufficient that we might see the body of the Church and the members who compose it. And concerning each particular member, when such signs of true religion and ecclesiastical obedience are present, we can prudently judge that person truly to be a member of the Church, though we cannot make such a judgment with absolutely infallible certitude.[208]

Suárez is doing at least two things here. First, he does not separate "juridic" aspects of ecclesial life—participation in *religio* and ecclesiastical obedience—from spiritual communion with the Church. Rather, *religio* and obedience to ecclesiastical hierarchy flow from and express that communion; they are a sign of one's relationship with Christ. Second, Suárez nevertheless regards our ability to discern ecclesial membership with a degree of epistemic humility. The essence of the Church is hidden and thus visible only to the eyes of faith.[209] Consequently, the members of the Church must be discerned with prudence, not claimed with infallibility. Because God has not revealed who is in the Church and who is not, a judgment on this matter cannot be endorsed with the unshakeable faith that receives revealed truth.[210]

An example warranting this caution appears later in Suárez's career in his treatment of those who deny the faith "only externally and with a false spirit (*ficto animo*) on account of the fear of torture or out of coveting for temporal goods or

recipere), tenebuntur profecto, per se loquendo, aliis actibus exterioribus fidem suam et professionem ejus, quam in baptismo receperunt potius quam fecerunt, aliquibus signis exterioribus ostendere, quam primum moraliter possint; imo existimo hoc fieri debere aliquibus temporibus in discursu vitae, ita ut unusquisque aliis fidelibus, inter quos vivit, catholicum et fidelem se ostendat.

[208] *De fide* 9.8.6 (*Op.* 12, 274B): *quamvis vera fides interior sit, tamen per externa signa videri aliquo modo potest; quamvis ergo non videatur ipsa forma qua membra Ecclesiae interius uniuntur inter seipsa, videtur saltem suis signis, atque hoc est satis ut videamus corpus Ecclesiae, et membra quae illud componunt; et de singulis quidem membris, quando adsunt talia signa verae religionis et obedientiae ecclesiasticae, prudenter judicare possumus vere esse membra Ecclesiae, quamvis non certitudine prorsus infallibili.*

[209] *Defensio fidei* 1.8.15 (*Op.* 24, 41B): *[Dona Ecclesiae] supernaturalia sunt et occulta, et per fidem creduntur, sed quia saltem faciunt rem evidenter credibilem.*

[210] Suárez repeats this teaching in *Defensio fidei* 1.8.11 (*Op.* 24, 40A).

honors." Suárez argues that such persons are not properly heretics or apostates, since they "properly and truly do not fall away from faith and Christian religion, but only pretend to do so."[211] Suárez repeats this teaching in his *De religione* when speaking of impediments to entering the Society of Jesus: those who deny the faith on account of fear or human love (*propter timorem vel amorem humanum*) do not incur the impediment of apostasy outlined in the *Constitutions*.[212] Thus, someone who by external criteria appears an apostate may indeed remain joined to the Church, and presumably still manifest faith and religion *in some way*.[213] Likewise, someone may only pretend to exhibit signs of belief and lack the virtue of faith altogether.[214] Yet both should be careful. Not only does the internal manifest itself externally,[215] but external manifestation can increase or decrease interior virtue. The affect of *religio* is "confirmed and increased" by external signs and diminished by the lack thereof. The true believer may thus lose his faith if his feigned apostasy becomes a habit, and the hypocrite may indeed come to believe internally what he feigns by his external actions.[216] The internal and external are in direct proportion to each other.

Suárez emphasizes this direct proportionality earlier in the *De Ecclesia* when responding to the argument that catechumens are not members of the Church because, though they have faith, they lack a visible bond of unity. Suárez writes that a catechumen typically *does* confess the faith externally, but even if his faith remains hidden, "he can remain for a time a visible member [of the Church]

[211] *De fide* 14.6.4 (*Op.* 12, 399A): *Nihilominus dicendum est eos, qui vel tormentum metu, vel propter cupiditatem temporalium bonorum aut honorum, exterius tantum et ficto animo fidem negant, et actiones confessioni fidei contrarias exercent . . . non sunt simpliciter haeretici, ut patet, quia fidem retinent; nec etiam sun simpliciter apostatae . . . quia isti simpliciter et vere non recedunt a fide et religione Christiana, sed tantum ficte, et ideo simpliciter non committunt apostasiam veram.*

[212] *De religione* 10.2.1.14 (*Op.* 16.1, 619A). A literary exploration of how early modern Jesuit missionaries wrestled with this complex teaching on apostasy can be found in Shusaku Endo, *Silence*, trans. William Johnston (New York: Picador, 1969).

[213] Not deeming them guilty of apostasy, Suárez speaks in *Defensio fidei* 1.15.10 (*Op.* 24, 76B) of many faithful in England who do not subject themselves to the religious opinions of the king but rather "bind their intellect in obedience to Christ and are not separated from the Roman Church at least in spirit and mind (*animo saltem et mente*)."

[214] *Defensio fidei* 1.8.15 (*Op.* 24, 41B). See also Suárez's preface to treatise 4 of the *De religione* (*Op.* 14, xiv–xv) on prayer. He writes that interior prayer is the "form or life" of vocal prayer. Yet someone can still pray vocally and not internally, though "this external prayer without the internal does not merit the name prayer" but rather "has the shadow, not the truth, of prayer."

[215] Prayer, too, is expressed vocally or in writing. Such external media are the effects of an "interior locution," or they are undeserving of the name prayer. See *De religione* 4.1.3.12 (*Op.* 14, 32A); 4.preface (*Op.* 14, xiv–xv).

[216] On this dynamic in Suárez's thought, see Pidel, "Francisco Suárez on Religion and Religious Pluralism."

joined only through the invisible form [of the Church], which form is manifest of itself through visible effects, although he may be deficient in them for some time."[217] For Suárez, the external manifestation of the *forma Ecclesiae* is a scalar category that corresponds to the degree to which one is bound to Christ. As he states later in the *Defensio*, not every member of the Church exhibits the signs of faith sufficiently (*sufficienter*).[218] Catechumens will manifest their faith through certain signs,[219] though these will be deficient compared to the signs deployed by those who possess faith and share in the sacramental life of the Church. Here Suárez avoids the misleading language of Domingo Bañez, according to whom "Catechumens properly pertain to the invisible Church . . . but pertain to the visible Church not properly, but relatively through the wish and desire for baptism."[220] For Suárez no such bifurcation between the "invisible" and "visible" Church exists.[221] Baptism is the formal manifestation of ecclesial unity, yet because ecclesial membership has a scalar component, there must be a gradation of material manifestations that correspond to one's degree of spiritual participation in the Church.[222] What Hugo Rahner said of St. Ignatius can be said equally of

[217] *De fide* 9.1.19 (*Op.* 12, 251A): *membrum enim visibile potest interdum manere conjunctum per solam invisibilem formam, quae de se per effectus visibiles manifestatur, quamvis aliquo tempore illis deficiat.*

[218] *Defensio fidei* 1.8.15 (*Op.* 24, 41B): *per haec signa non ostendatur sufficienter fides vel sanctitas in singulis membris Ecclesiae, propter fictionem quae in unaquaque determinata persona esse potest.*

[219] Suárez even thinks it *vix esse moraliter possibile* for a catechumen to profess the faith *nullo exteriori signo.* See *De fide* 9.1.19 (*Op.* 12, 251A).

[220] Bañez, *Commentaria in secundam secundae*, col. 110: *Catechumeni simpliciter pertinent ad ecclesiam invisibilem, siquidem sunt membra Christi per charitatem, sed ad ecclesiam visibilem non pertinent simpliciter, sed secundum quid, videlicet, per votum & desiderium baptismi.* Here Bañez is making the same point as Bellarmine, namely, that someone can possess faith and charity yet lack formal, visible union with the Church through baptism. Yet Bañez's use of the term "invisible church" is puzzling and one that cannot be found in either Bellarmine or Suárez.

[221] Suárez does state in the *Defensio fidei* 1.8.18 (*Op.* 24, 42B) that the whole Church, in the sense that it is the kingdom of God, is "*per se* invisible," but he never divides the invisible from the visible, nor does he ever relegate people to one aspect of the Church or another. We will return to this point in section 2.4.3.

[222] Thus Suárez does not, as Joseph Clifford Fenton suggests in "The Status of St. Robert Bellarmine's Teaching," 211, deny "the necessity of the external bond of unity." Fenton primarily argues this suggestion from *De fide* 9.1.13–14 (*Op.* 12, 248B–49A), where Suárez defends the inclusion of schismatics and excommunicates within the Church. Suárez states that "among Catholics" some require "besides faith some external conjunction in the members of the Church both among themselves and with a head. *Therefore* they exclude from the Church schismatics and excommunicates." When Suárez argues against those Catholics in question, he appears to oppose their opinion that schismatics and excommunicates are *extra Ecclesiam*, not the opinion that some external conjunction between members and head is required. In *De fide* 9.1.14, Suárez defends the essential union of such members both with the head and with other members, and his position in *De fide* 9.8.6 regarding the exterior signs of interior faith could hardly be reconciled with 9.1.13–14 if in the latter he rejected external requirements.

Suárez, that for him it is "a fundamental law of all spiritual life that spirit always tends towards flesh."[223]

2.4.3. Prayer *in persona Ecclesiae*: A Social Account of Visible Unity

In the state of ecclesial life, prayer is a foundational act that, in its interior and exterior aspects as well as in its private and public manifestations, reveals the visible and social unity of the Church.[224] The manifestation of interior, mental prayer pertains to our discussion of Suárez's hylomorphic rationale for ecclesial visibility. For one thing, if it is truly prayer and not just a "shadow," vocal prayer follows upon an interior movement into God. Of course, vocal prayer is not a necessary effect of interior prayer. It is possible to pray "in the mind alone."[225] Nevertheless, even in mental prayer, the habit of prayer and "the composure of the body for a certain time and place" serve as signs "in which the occupation of the mind can be observed, or at least guessed at through them."[226] In this section, however, we will focus closely on the relationship between private and public prayer, showing how each contributes to the visible unity of the Church because of the social nature not only of human beings, but also of the ecclesial body.

Suárez illustrates the ecclesial element of private prayer in his commentary on the Lord's Prayer in the *De religione*. There, Suárez devotes a column to the final word, *Amen*, writing that some suggest that the Lord's Prayer is not "said by the faithful in their own person, but in the person of the Church." Suárez admits that even St. Thomas seems to make this affirmation.[227] Nevertheless Suárez thinks that both are true: that the faithful pray this prayer both in their own person and in the person of the Church. Something can be prayed *in persona Ecclesiae* in two ways: with the Church as the one prayed for, and with the Church as the one doing the praying. Regarding the former, Suárez

[223] Hugo Rahner, S.J., *Ignatius the Theologian*, trans. Michael Barry (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1964), 214, 219–20. Rahner adds: "Ignatius was 'Roman' and 'papal' because of his theology of Discernment of Spirits: Christ's Vicar in Rome was for him a kind of supreme instance of that visibility which was both an essential mark of the Church and a necessary yardstick for measuring the invisible."

[224] *De religione* 4.preface (*Op.* 14, xiv).

[225] *De religione* 4.preface (*Op.* 14, xiv): *nullus est actus religionis, ab affectu colendi distinctus, qui non possit et sola mente fieri, et per corpus exhiberi.*

[226] *De religione* 7.1.6.10 (*Op.* 15, 30B–31A): *Et huc etiam spectant talis habitus et compositio corporis pro tali tempore et loco, quae ad internam attentionem et reverentiam conferat; in quibus signis quodammodo conspici mentis occupatio, vel saltem per illa conjectari potest.*

[227] *De religione* 4.3.8.40 (*Op.* 14, 254B), citing Aquinas, *ST* II-II, q. 83, a. 16, ad 3.

writes that when each member of the faithful prays the Our Father, he prays for the whole Church. Therefore, Cyprian deems the prayer public, not private. Nevertheless, according to Suárez, this fact does not negate the role of each of the faithful, each in his or her own person, praying for the whole: "we ought to pray, each one for all."[228] Regarding the Church as subject, Suárez admits that the Our Father can be said in a representative and ministerial way as in the Mass or divine office. And this sort of prayer is good, but it is not necessary, for when Christ gave us the Our Father, he did so "to individuals" for whom the typical mode of prayer is private. Nor should we shun such private prayer as comparatively inadequate. Christ gave power and authority to this prayer when uttered by individuals even in serious sin, a power that in no way lags behind in comparison to its ministerial recitation. Here Suárez seeks to avoid diminishing the role that the individual faithful play in sustaining the *religio* of the Church.[229] Suárez's teaching on the Lord's Prayer thus reflects the proto-theology of the laity discussed in chapter 1.[230]

The link between individual and communal *religio* appears again later when Suárez comes to discuss the public prayers of the Church, such as the divine office. He admits that the faithful can pray communally in two ways. In one way, a community may pray gathered together at the same time, but each member prays individually, as if privately,

> just as is evident in a religious community, all of whose adherents come together at the same hour to pray from a common rite and consensus. And therefore in this common mode of prayer it is not necessary per se that all those who pray thus come together in the same common place, but they could be in the same house, and in different cells, nay even in different

[228] *De religione* 4.3.8.40 (*Op.* 14, 254B): *[O]bjective appello, quia fieri debet pro tota Ecclesia. . . . Hoc tamen non obstat, quominus haec oratio ab unoquoque fideli in propria persona dicatur, quia singuli debemus pro omnibus orare.*

[229] *De religione* 4.3.8.40 (*Op.* 14, 254B): *Altero ergo modo intelligi potest, ut haec oratio proferatur in persona Ecclesiae, quasi repraesentative, et ministerialiter, quod voco subjective. Et hoc quidem potest esse verum, quando Ecclesia ita instituit, ut in Missa, et in Canonico officio. Non est tamen verum, si intelligitur id esse necessarium, aut esse ex institutione Christi: hoc enim nullo fundamento nititur. Quando enim Christus dixit,* sic ergo vos orabitis, *ad singulos locutus est, et ordinarium modum orandi private, et in propria persona docuit. Unde haec oratio facta ab existente in peccato mortali non magis habet ab Ecclesia vim aliquam, vel auctoritatem impetrandi, quam aliae privatae orationes ejusdem peccatoris.*

[230] Chapter 1, section 1.3.4. Suárez, *De religione* 4.3.6.8 (*Op.* 14, 235A), will even remind his readers that *moraliter loquendo, et parentes vel pastores tenentur haec [the duty to pray and what to pray] docere filios vel oves suas ratione sui oficii, et ipsi fideles tenentur aliquo modo hanc orationem discere, saltem quantum necesse est ad convenienter orandum, quamvis in rigore praecepti non teneantur verba et seriem illius orationis memoria retinere.*

> homes and among different peoples, and come together in the manner of one mystical body in the same hour to pray either mentally or vocally.[231]

Indeed, even though this prayer is communal only *per accidens*, it nevertheless has power and fruit because of the special promise of Christ in Matthew 18:20: "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there I am in their midst." For Suárez, the social aspect of prayer is not manifest only by local proximity, but by the ability of human beings to unite themselves internally by an act of prayer, which is thus deemed communal on account of the unity of faith and intention among those praying. Even mental prayer can be a means for Christians to be united by Christ in their midst, a unity that is not primarily local, but mystical.[232]

The most visible and acceptable prayer before God, however, is public and common prayers "by the Christian people or in their name."[233] This prayer happens when the faithful come together and pray "in the person of all"; their individual voices, actions, and wills "running together," united by one spirit in "a prayer most proper to a single community."[234] Such prayer requires a union not only of affect and will but also of voice and action, though individual members of the community participate in various ways: some with words and actions, others through presence and consent. Suárez affirms the "pious" opinion of Denys the Carthusian among others that such prayer is the result of something miraculous and has "great power before God," a power made manifest "in visible sign."[235]

[231] *De religione* 4.4.1.3 (*Op.* 14, 266B): *Hic autem modus communis potest etiam in oratione mentali inveniri, sicut patet in communitate religiosa, cujus personae omnes eadem hora ad sic orandum conveniunt, ex communi ritu et consensu. Ideoque ad hunc modum communis orationis, per se necessarium non est ut omnes, qui sic orant, in eodem loco communi proxime conveniant, sed esse possunt in eadem domo, et diversis cellis, imo etiam in diversis domibus et populis esse possunt, et per modum unius corporis mystici eadem hora ad orandum, vel mentaliter, vel vocaliter convenire.*

[232] *De religione* 4.4.1.3 (*Op.* 14, 266A–B).

[233] *De religione* 4.4.1.5 (*Op.* 14, 267A): *Dico ergo, chorum ecclesiasticum, in quo publicae et communes orationes a christiano populo seu illius nomine fiunt, sanctum esse, et Spiritus Sancti instinctu in Ecclesia introductum, ut antiquissima et universalis traditio ostendit.*

[234] *De religione* 4.4.1.4 (*Op.* 14, 266B): *Alio ergo modo fieri potest oratio a communitate, quia una oratio funditur in persona omnium, ita ut omnes orent ut membra illius communitatis, et oratio ab omnibus fundatur, singulis partialiter aliquo modo concurrentibus, etiamsi non omnes aeque loquantur, vel eumdem modum actionis exerceant, sed quidam loquantur, alii adsint et consentiant, aut alio modo cooperentur. Et haec est proprissima unius communitatis oratio. . . .* [*Ille modus orationis explicatur a Tertulliano* (*Apolog. Cap. 39*)] *quasi uno ore et uno spiritu a tota communitate offerri.*

[235] *De religione* 4.4.1.4 (*Op.* 14, 267A): *non solum corda, sed etiam vocem ad Deum elevasse [fideles] significantur . . . non tantum communi voluntatum consensu, sed stiam quasi uno ore idem omnino precati sunt, quod non sine miraculo accidisse pie Carthusianus et alii considerant. Unde illa oratio tantam habuit vim apud Deum, ut ejus efficacia statim visibili signo commotionis totius domus, et fervoris praedicatorum Evangelii, manifestata fuerit.*

In addition to citing supporting evidence from Scripture and the tradition, Suárez offers the rationale behind such public prayer: "For the Church is one mystical body, in which we are all one in Christ, and therefore *as one* she ought to worship and to venerate God. For this reason, one sacrifice is offered in the name of the whole Church, and, wherever it is offered, it is offered by the whole Church." Such prayer is "more acceptable to God and Christ" because it is offered "by his Bride, who cannot be unholy and is always pleasing to him, even if there are many among her who are wicked and unworthy." Further, this kind of prayer fosters the charity of the whole Church since "all learn that prayer should be made for all by a common spirit, and even more, these public and common prayers move each one to devotion and compunction."[236] The sheer, visible action of communal prayer not only instructs the faithful, but increases their charity and devotion. Just as the individual actions of the faithful have a direct impact on individual, internal affect and virtue, so too the social action of the Church increases the charity and devotion in each member of the faithful.

Suárez notes that such common prayer occurs in particular churches, each of which has "its own special unity and thus can communally pray to God in its own more special way." Nevertheless, Suárez adds that particular churches are also part of the one Church, which is "simply one and more dear to God that any church in particular." Thus, the universal Church should also pray together "to intercede for all her children . . . and not only for her own members, but also for nonbelievers, that they may be converted to God."[237] But how can the universal Church come together as one and offer one communal prayer? Suárez writes that it was for this very reason that Christ established ministers and priests of the Church "who pray in the name of the Church, to whom the Church has committed its role and authority, in order that they may pour forth prayers in the

[236] *De religione* 4.4.1.10 (*Op.* 14, 268B): *Ecclesia est unum corpus mysticum, in quo omnes unum sumus in Christo, ideoque debet per modum unius Deum colere et venerari, atque hac ratione in nomine totius Ecclesiae unum offertur sacrificium, et ubicumque offertur, a tota Ecclesia offertur. . . . Talis oratio, caeteris paribus, est magis acceptabilis Deo et Christo, quia ab ejus Sponsa offertur, quae non esse potest non sancta, et sibi grata, etiamsi in ea multi mali sint, et indigni. . . . Hic modus orationis multum fovet totius Ecclesiae charitatem, cum omnes discunt communi spiritu pro omnibus esse orandum, praeterquam quod hae orationes publicae et communes ad devotionem et compunctionem singulos movent.*

[237] *De religione* 4.4.1.10 (*Op.* 14, 269A): *Quia licet particulares Ecclesiae suo modo sint plures, et unaquaeque earum suam habeat peculiarem unitatem, et ita specialiori modo possit communiter Deum precari, nihilominus omnes sunt partes unius Ecclesiae, quae simpliciter una est, et Deo charior quacumque Ecclesia particulari. . . . Ideoque tota etiam simul orare debet, et pro omnibus suis filiis intercedere. Ad illam etiam maxime pertinet pro totius conservatione et augmento sollicitam esse, et ita non solum pro suis membris, sed etiam pro infidelibus interdum orat, ut ad Deum convertantur.*

name of the whole body," that is, "for himself and for his children as members of the Church." In this way, "the whole Church prays *as one* to God through his minister, as through a legate or ambassador." Suárez calls this "the best sign" of common prayer, joined as it is with a minister bearing authority from Christ and the Church.[238] Suárez speaks of all priests and ministers, not just the pope, as praying in the name of the universal Church. Yet the reason priests and ministers can pray with such authority is only by their unity with Christ's Vicar on earth: the pope has been given the power to establish and to commission priests and ministers as his deputies in offering prayer and oblation in the name of the whole Church. For Suárez, then, one of the best visible signs of the Church is the gathering of the faithful in common prayer with a minister instituted by Christ through his Vicar.[239]

Such public prayer offered by the minister in the name of the whole Church still remains properly communal. For example, when speaking of the Eucharistic sacrifice in his *De sacramentis*, Suárez makes clear that the faithful offer the sacrifice of the Eucharist *with* the priest in two ways.[240] First, they offer the sacrifice in a most general way, by the fact that they are members of the Church. Each of the faithful thus offers the sacrifice inasmuch as "the whole body of the Church, which includes the celebrant, is rightly designated as the one offering the sacrifice." If we consider the people as distinct from the priest, then they are said to offer sacrifice through the priest who stands "in the place of the whole body" (*vice totius corporis*).[241] Second, the faithful offer the sacrifice of the Eucharist in a more particular way by cooperating with the priest, for example, in assisting at Mass or giving alms to the priest celebrating that Mass.[242] In both cases, the

[238] *De religione* 4.4.1.11 (*Op.* 14, 269A): *hac ratione institutos esse ejusdem Ecclesiae ministros et sacerdotos, qui nomine totius Ecclesiae orent, quibus Ecclesia commisit vices suas, ut nomine totius corporis orationes fundant. Et hoc est optimum signum hujus communis orationis.*

[239] *De religione* 4.4.1.11 (*Op.* 14, 269A–B).

[240] *De sacramentis* 77.3.1 (*Op.* 21, 696B): *Ergo plebs fidelis simul cum sacerdote offert.*

[241] *De sacramentis* 77.3.3 (*Op.* 21, 697B–98A): *Denominatio autem extrinseca potest in hunc modum declarari, scilicet, quia totum corpus Ecclesise, ut sacerdotem offerentem includit, recte denominatur offerens, quia id praestat per membrum suum, quasi per instrumentum ad id deputatum, sicut humanum corpus (servanda est enim proportio) operari dicitur quod facit manus. Si autem Ecclesia consideretur ut condistincta a sacerdote, tanquam populus, inter quem, et Deum, sacerdos intercedit, dicetur offerre per sacerdotem denominatione, quodammodo magis extrinsica, quatenus ille constitutus est ut minister publicus ad praestanda Deo totius Ecclesiae munera; haec ergo denominatio utroque modo considerata ad singula membra Ecclesiae extenditur magis adhuc improprie, quia sunt membra corporis, cujus publica auctoritate et quasi communi consensu, sacerdos deputatus est, ut sacrificium offerat vice totius corporis.*

[242] *De sacramentis* 77.3.3 (*Op.* 21, 698A): *Alio ergo modo potest haec denominatio esse magis specialis, et sic requirit aliquem specialem concursum, non tantum internum, ut rationes supra factae probant, sed etiam externum, qualis erit, petere aut procurare sacrificium, dare eleemosynam seu stipendium sacerdoti,*

people of God participate in the *religio* of the Church in a visible and communal way.

Yet, Suárez still wrestles with the fact of a variety of people and ministers praying in ways distinct to their own community: how can such diverse prayer truly be a visible sign of universal unity? Suárez responds that the whole ecclesiastical duty (*officium*) is

> substantially one, that is, consisting in the same proximate matter . . . and the same principal parts . . . and this suffices to make the whole prayer of this Church to be one, and to be poured forth in the person of the whole universal Church, even if in some accidentals and more minor rites there be some variety, which does not diminish unity in the mystical body, but rather adorns it.[243]

The *religio* of the Church must evidence some uniformity in substance to be considered one. Nevertheless, other aspects of *religio* can admit a degree of diversity according to people and places. And such diversity can even touch on central aspects of the ecclesial mystery like baptism and the Eucharist. This point is evident in Suárez's treatment of the Greeks, when he affirms the legitimacy of sacramental differences such as baptizing in the passive voice (*baptizetur*) and consecrating leavened bread, while maintaining the unity of the sacramental essence between East and West. This diversity is not a necessary and inevitable evil, but something that adorns and enhances unity. We will return to this fact in chapter 3. It suffices here to conclude that in the private and public prayers of the faithful, there are degrees of visible unity rooted in the social character of the Church. In their private prayers, the faithful always remain united to the "person of the Church," a unity that does not dissolve their individual offering but affirms and elevates it. In public prayers, the faithful join the priest in a miraculous union of heart and voice to offer prayer and sacrifice to the Father. This sign is "best" because it both proclaims the Church's visible unity and also effects it: her faith and charity grow in this most visible manifestation of Christ's mystical body.

inservire illi sacrificanti, vel denique assistere consentiendo, ac moraliter cooperando, et haec est magis propria denominatio offerentis, non tanquam principii per se ac immediati actionis sacrificandi, quod est proprium sacerdotis, sed tanquam cooperantis aliquo modo ipsi sacerdoti.

[243] *De religione* 4.4.1.13 (*Op.* 14, 270A): *Respondeo imprimis, totum ecclesiasticum officium, quo Ecclesia Catholica utitur, substantialiter esse unum, id est, ex eadem materia proxima, ut sic dicam, et eisdem partibus principalibus constans, ut ex dicendis patebit; idque satis esse ut tota haec Ecclesiae deprecatio una sit, et in persona totius Ecclesiae universalis fundatur, licet in aliquibus accidentalibus et minutioribus ritibus sit aliqua varietas, quae unitatem non minuit in corpore mystico, sed ornat potius.*

2.4.4. An Incarnational and Sacramental Account of Visible Unity

In addition to hylomorphic and social reasons behind ecclesial visibility, Suárez also describes the Church as something incarnational.[244] Again, the relationship between religious affect and external manifestation finds its fullest expression in the Church, and "this is no surprise, because the Church adores God, having been made flesh, with corporeal members, with bended knee and hands outstretched."[245] Here in the *De religione*, Suárez links the two forms of ecclesial visibility, members (matter) and operations (form), to God "having been made flesh" in Christ and the members of his mystical body. Suárez's teaching that external manifestation directly corresponds to the degree of ecclesial union can thus be attributed to his strict conflation of ecclesial and Christic union. Put simply, the more the members of the Church are united to Christ, the more Christ is visible in their lives. Indeed, the incarnate Christ is himself the prototype, guarantor, and *ratio* of ecclesial visibility.

Suárez develops this connection between ecclesial visibility and the enfleshment of God in his *Defensio fidei.* After employing the analogy of how an equine or human soul is manifest in external operations, Suárez invokes the example of Christ himself via Matthew 11:3–5. The disciples of John the Baptist come to Jesus asking if he is the one foretold, and Christ replies, "Announce to John what you have heard and seen. The blind see, the lame walk, etc." Suárez exposits:

> It is as if Christ were saying: "in the signs which I perform, you can see that I am the Messiah, since I exhibit those things which the Prophets foretold." . . . For by these works it was made manifest that [Jesus' adversaries] ought to put faith in him. In this way, therefore, we say that the Church is visible, because she has always exhibited such signs and visible rays, as it were, of her truth, in order that in such signs, or through them, she could and ought be seen.[246]

[244] Chapter 1, section 1.3.2.

[245] *De religione* 2.1.1.9 (*Op.* 13, 80B): *Hoc etiam suadet vetustissima consuetudo, non solum Ecclesiae in lege gratiae (de quo mirum non est, quod Deum, factum carnem, ipsis etiam corporeis membris, et genibus flexis, et manibus extensis adoret), verum etiam omnium fidelium Sanctorum, tam in lege veteri, quam naturali.*

[246] *Defensio fidei* 1.8.8–9 (*Op.* 24, 39B): *ac si diceret: In signis quae ego facio, videre potestis me esse Messiam; quia illa exhibeo, quae in Prophetis erant praedicata. . . . Quia nimirum per ipsa propalabatur, ut ei fidem adhibere* [*homines*] *obligarentur. Ita ergo dicimus Ecclesiam esse visibilem, quia talia semper exhibuit signa, et quasi radios visibiles suae veritatis, ut in eis, vel per ea videri possit ac debeat.*

For Suárez, the visibility of the Church functions in the same way as the miracles of Christ: both signify an inner reality which in turn gives meaning to the sign itself. And just as Christ's miracles did not eliminate the need for faith, so too the Church's visibility does nothing to negate the fact that the Church is a mystery requiring belief. Suárez explains:

> The Church which we believe by faith to be true is a certain object which can be seen with the eyes and heard with the ears and in some way touched with the hands. For this is typically enough for some believed object to be called sensible, even if we believe some invisible mystery about it. In such a way the sacraments are called sensible even though the formal intelligibility or truth of the sacraments is not perceived. Even Christ the Lord was a visible object when he was walking on earth, and yet by divine faith he was being believed to be the true Messiah by many who could say that they themselves saw the Messiah whom they were hoping for, and whom they were believing to be present.[247]

For Suárez, ecclesial visibility serves the inner reality of the Church in the same manner as the sacramental *signum* points to the *res*, or Christ's humanity gives testimony to his divinity. In none of these three cases—the Church, the sacraments, or the incarnation—does the visible diminish the mystery it serves. The invisible mystery always retains primacy, which is why Suárez affirms that in her spiritual gifts the Church is "*per se* invisible." Her essence is as invisible as the *res* of a sacrament or the divinity of Christ.[248] Suárez uses similar language when discussing the ecclesial state of perfection in the *De religione*. It is "*per se* and principally ordered to contemplation and mental prayer," that is, to the interior and invisible, but this invisibility in no way eliminates the fact that one of the requisites for the state of perfection is that its actions be external.[249] And even though interior prayer need not always

[247] *Defensio fidei* 1.8.6 (*Op.* 24, 38B): *Illa Ecclesia, quam fide credimus esse veram, objectum quoddam est, quod visu videri, et auribus audiri, et manibus quodammodo contrectari potest. Hoc enim satis esse solet, ut objectum aliquod creditum sensibile dicatur, etiamsi de illo credamus aliquod mysterium invisibile: sic sacramenta sensibilia vocantur, quamvis formalis ratio sacramenti aut veritas non sentiantur. Imo etiam Christus Dominus objectum visibile erat, cum in terris ambulabat, et tamen fide divina credebatur a multis tanquam verus Messias, qui recte dicere poterant se videre Messiam, quem sperabant, et quem praesentem credebant.*

[248] *Defensio fidei* 1.8.18 (*Op.* 24, 42B).

[249] *De religione* 7.1.6.10, 12 (*Op.* 15, 29B, 30B): *Quintam conditionem addimus . . . quod hujusmodi actiones* [*opera perfectionis*]*, ad quas hic status ordinatur, externae sint. . . . [N]on oportet ut omnes actus talis status vel externi sint, vel in externis moraliter includantur, seu, quod per eos, tanquam per effectus humano modo innotescant; sed satus est ut per externas actiones et privationes possit homo disponi ad*

manifest itself vocally, nevertheless, as pointed out earlier, even the habit of prayer and "the composure of the body for a certain time and place" serve as a sign "in which the occupation of the mind can be observed."[250] For Suárez the Church operates in a similar way: the invisible essence is revealed in the persons and actions of the faithful.

Such actions of the faithful not only reveal the visible unity of the Church in the present, but preserve the Church's diachronic, visible unity. In chapter 8 of the *Defensio,* Suárez invokes the first type of visible unity, that of the members of the Church, as a defense of her perpetual visibility from the time of Christ to the present. According to him, the Protestants invented the idea of an invisible Church to account for "that time in which they did not exist," whereas the Roman Catholic Church boasts an uninterrupted succession of faithful, not to mention bishops and popes.[251] Yet the Church's perpetual visibility is also preserved through a "continuous succession" of the *actions and signs* of the faithful.[252] And given the symbiotic relationship between the exterior and interior, such actions also preserve the sacred tradition at the heart of the Church, since the more often the unwritten word is repeated,

> the more easily it is preserved, and this is what happens in the body of the Church through the frequent confession and celebration of the mysteries of faith. Whence it can be said that the unwritten word is not only retained in the memory, but also preserved in the oft repeated words and deeds, or external signs of the faithful.[253]

The religious actions of the faithful are not only manifestations of their own, personal faith and thereby evidence of their membership in the Church; such actions also preserve the sacred memory of the Church herself and speak to her diachronic, *visible* unity. The perpetuity of the Church, though supernaturally

hujusmodi actus, vel ab externis rebus aut operationibus, quae illos impediunt, abstrahi. Et sic status perfectionis per se ac principaliter ordinatur ad contemplationem vel mentalem orationem.

[250] *De religione* 7.1.6.10 (*Op.* 15, 30B–31A): *Et huc etiam spectant talis habitus et compositio corporis pro tali tempore et loco, quae ad internam attentionem et reverentiam conferat; in quibus signis quodammodo conspici mentis occupatio, vel saltem per illa conjectari potest.* On the fact that not every internal prayer need be expressed externally, see *De religione* 4.preface (*Op.* 14, xiv).

[251] *Defensio fidei* 1.8.7 (*Op.* 24, 39A); 1.7.16–17 (*Op.* 24, 36A–B).

[252] *Defensio fidei* 1.8.10 (*Op.* 24, 39B): *per continuam successionem.*

[253] *Defensio fidei* 1.9.15 (*Op.* 24, 48A): *licet verbum non scriptum, semel aut iterum prolatum, transitorium sit, tamen ut saepius repetitum facile conservatur, et ita contingit in corpore Ecclesiae per frequentem confessionem, ac celebrationem mysteriorum fidei. Unde dici potest, non solum memoria retineri, sed etiam verbis et factis, seu signis externis fidelium saepe repetitis conservari.*

guaranteed and effected, nevertheless depends on the incarnational life of every member of the faithful.

2.5. Conclusion

In this chapter we have argued that Suárez advocates a Christic account of ecclesial unity that gives priority to interior unity and the ecclesial mystery, but never at the expense of the Church's visible unity, just as Christ's divinity does not eliminate the necessity of his humanity. The Church is visibly *one* first in her material cause, her members, who *are* the Church by their union with Christ. This union is gradated: some are perfect members, others are "imperfect members" and participate in a "degree of inferior life." Suárez grounds the idea of gradated membership in his conflation of membership in the Church and union with Christ. The shortcoming of Suárez's position is that because such union is a personal condition, membership can be ascertained only through prudent judgment. Yet Suárez is willing to take that risk in order to maintain a robust unity between Christ and his body; Christ has no body other than the Church, and the Church has no principle of unity other than Christ.

Suárez's second form of ecclesial visibility, the operations flowing from the *forma Ecclesiae*, reinforces the scalar components of his ecclesiology by recognizing a variety and gradation of manifestation. In the words of the *Defensio*, "the Church coalesces through the mode of one body out of various members, and she is preserved through their mutual work and influence among each other."[254] Some of these works are performed privately by individual faithful, others commonly and publicly. Some actions are deficient, others are only material, and still others, like baptism, the sacraments, and ecclesiastical obedience, are proper and formal to the ecclesial way of life, visibly preserving her sacred memory both diachronically and synchronically.

Finally, some actions even serve as "ornamentation" for the beautification of the Church. As Suárez writes in the *De Ecclesia*, besides her internal glory, the Church also requires external ornamentation, for she is a "queen bedecked in variety." This ornamentation, however, like every aspect of her visibility, still comes from and serves the primary reality of the Church, her invisible essence, which

[254] *Defensio fidei* 1.7.18 (*Op.* 24, 37A): *[C]onstat hanc Ecclesiam, quae per modum unius corporis ex variis membris coalescit, et per mutuam operam, et influxum eorum inter se conservatur.*

is the object of our belief. Indeed, "by seeing external signs and testimonies of the true Church," we see the Church, but "we believe its internal beauty and form."[255] For Suárez, the Church is a sacrament, an incarnational reality that visibly, humanly, and diversely draws *viatores* to her invisible, supernatural, and singular source, Jesus Christ.[256]

[255] *De fide* 9.8.7 (*Op.* 12, 274B, 275A): *Unde in Psal. 44, praeter interiorem gloriam Ecclesiae, requiritur ornamentum externum, quod* vestitui deaurato *comparatur,* et circumdatum *dicitur* varietate. . . . *Ita nos videmus quidem Ecclesiam, videndo exteriora signa et verae Ecclesiae testimonia, credimus autem internam pulchritudinem et formam ejus.*

[256] Indeed, Suárez's ecclesiology is a far cry from the extrinsicist and juridical caricatures of early modern ecclesiology so prevalent today. See my Introduction, section I.1. See also George Weigel, *Evangelical Catholicism: Deep Reform in the 21st-Century Church* (New York: Basic Books, 2013), 55.

3

The Missional Catholicity of the Church

3.1. Introduction

Pope Paul III's bull convoking the Council of Trent refers to the unity of the Church as a "catholic unity."[1] The modifier "catholic" is left undefined in the bull, and indeed throughout the Council's approved decrees. At various moments the Council speaks of the catholic "truth"[2] or "faith"[3] or "doctrine,"[4] and more frequently speaks of the catholic "Church,"[5] at one moment qualifying that this catholic Church is "everywhere diffused" (*ubique diffusa*).[6] The Catechism of Trent gives greater clarification: the Church is catholic, "that is, universal . . . because she is diffused in the splendor of one faith from the rising of the sun to its setting." Unlike "human commonwealths or the conventicles of heretics" restricted by geographic bounds, the Church "embraces all human beings in the bosom of her charity" from the time of Adam to the present age. She is also called "catholic" because she is the universal means of salvation, the one ark in which the desire for salvation is fulfilled.[7]

[1] Paul III, *Bulla indictionis sacrosancti oecumenici concilii Tridentini*, Latin text in H. J. Schroeder, trans., *Canons and Decreed of the Council of Trent* (St. Louis and London: B. Herder, 1941), 285: *qui a catholica unitate dissentiunt.*

[2] *Council of Trent,* session 23, ch. 4 (DH §1770).

[3] *Council of Trent,* session 5 (DH §1510); session 18 (Schroeder, 399).

[4] *Council of Trent*, session 23, preface (DH §1763).

[5] *Council of Trent*, session 18 (Schroeder, 401); session 21, preface (DH §1725); session 25 (DH §1821).

[6] *Council of Trent*, session 5, no. 4 (DH §1514).

[7] *Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad parochos* (Rome: Paulus Manutius, 1566), 64: *Tertia proprietas Ecclesiae ea est, ut Catholica, nempe universalis, vocetur . . . quoniam, ut testatur sanctus Augustinus, A solis ortu usque ad occasum unius fidei splendore diffunditur. Neque enim, ut in humanis respub. aut haereticorum conventibus, unius tantum regni terminis, aut uno hominum genere Ecclesia definita est: verum omnes homines, sive illi barbari sint, sive Scythae, sice servi, sive liberi, sive*

Unity and Catholicity in Christ. Eric J. DeMeuse, Oxford University Press. © Oxford University Press 2022.
DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780197638637.003.0004

While both the Council of Trent and the Catechism hint at the *fact* of the Church's geographic catholicity (she *is* spread everywhere), other defining elements of catholicity are present in the foregoing passages: catholicity with regard to doctrine, or catholicity as a means of salvation open to all humans. Nevertheless, scholars today have argued that after the Council of Trent, Catholic theologians reduced the notion of catholicity to its geographic character. Still more, such theologians conceived of this geographic catholicity as the mere transplanting of ecclesial uniformity throughout the world. Richard R. Gaillardetz observes an "unprecedented uniformity at the level of liturgy, church discipline, and theology" in the centuries between Trent and Vatican II, with catholicity "practically collapsed into the marks of unity [read: uniformity] and apostolicity, that is, visible union with and obedience to the apostolic see of Rome." Such theologians thus failed to understand other elements of catholicity, and in particular "catholicity as a unity in diversity."[8]

These accusations are not entirely without warrant. As Gustave Thils notes, most of the ecclesiological treatises written in the seventeenth century, including those of Suárez, define the mark of catholicity in terms of a "universality of space and time."[9] This understanding of catholicity was even a common definition among Protestant theologians describing their own congregations.[10] Yet geographic and diachronic catholicity are rarely the only definitions given.[11] Further, in the case of Suárez, geographic catholicity could hardly be considered

masculi, sive feminae, charitatis sinu complectitur. . . . Universalis etiam ob eam causam dicitur, quod omnes, qui salutem aeternam consequi cupiunt, eam tenere, & amplecti debeant, non secus ac qui arcam, ne diluvio perirent, ingressi sunt.

[8] Richard R. Gaillardetz, *The Church in the Making: Lumen Gentium, Christus Dominus, Orientalium Ecclesiarum* (New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2006), 61–62. As noted in the Introduction, Avery Cardinal Dulles makes a near identical claim in *The Catholicity of the Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 82, 99, 131.

[9] Gustave Thils, *Les notes de l'Église dans l'apologétique catholique depuis la réforme* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1937), 227.

[10] The English Huguenot Isaac Casaubon, *Anglican Catholicity Vindicated against Roman Innovations in the Answer of Isaac Casaubon to Carinal Perron*, ed. W. R. Whittingham and Hall Harrison (Baltimore: Turnbull Brothers, [1612] 1875), 5, defines the word *catholic* to mean "vniuersall, diffused ouer the whole world." Johann Gerhard, *On the Church*, in *Theological Commonplaces XXV*, trans. Richard J. Dinda, ed. Benjamin T. G. Mayes (St. Louis: Concordia, [1610–1622] 2010), §160, 294, will speak of the church of the Lutherans possessing both "external" universality of place, age, and time, and "internal" universality of prophetic and apostolic orthodoxy.

[11] Thils, *Les notes*, 214–39. See also Domingo Bañez, O.P., *Commentaria in secundam secundae angelici doctoris D. Thomae* (Venice: Bernardus Iunta, 1586), col. 115–16; Gregory of Valencia, S.J., *Analysis fidei Catholicae* (Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1605), 133–35; Stanislaus Hosius, *Confessio fidei catholicae christiana* (Dillingen: 1557), ch. 22.

the transplanting of uniformity. As will be shown, at least in his later works, diversity becomes a fundamental feature of Suárez's definition of catholicity.

In this chapter, we will trace Suárez's understanding of catholicity from his early treatise *De Ecclesia* (1580s) to his later works, particularly the *Defensio fidei* and *De religione*. While his earliest account of catholicity identifies a universality of place, persons, time, and doctrine in the Church, his later account in the *Defensio* offers a similar but slightly different account, attributing to catholicity a fullness of faith, a universal *ratio credendi*, a diversity of persons and orders, and a universality of place. I will examine these latter four dimensions in turn to show their distinctive features and the reason why Suárez develops them, focusing in particular on his *De religione* and his polemics with James I. In addition, I will demonstrate how Suárez integrates all of these dimensions into a coherent notion of catholicity. This integration is rooted in both the Christological and missional character of catholicity. The fullness and universal appeal of faith is rooted in the unity and universality of the person of Christ communicated through his body, the Church, in her missionary work. Drawing heavily on an interpretation of St. Paul's notion of the body of Christ, Suárez argues that the Church conveys this faith through a diversity of persons and offices, all proclaiming the one Christ not despite, but on account of, such diversity. Indeed, this diversity is necessary in order for the Church to enjoy geographic universality, a fact rooted less in the need for quantitative, temporal gain than in the need for Christ to envelop all of humanity. As Suárez affirms, quoting St. Jerome, "If Christ does not have the Church diffused throughout the whole world . . . he is made poor beyond measure."[12] For Suárez, the missions are a spiritual necessity born from the unity of the Church and the body of Christ: in her missionary activity, the Church assuages the poverty of Christ, who, as we discussed in chapter 2, desires that all be saved and come to a knowledge of the truth. The fact that non-Catholics *can* be saved through exceptional circumstances does not render the work of missionaries unnecessary. Rather, the catholicity of the Church, working in her members, combats obstacles to the diffusion (*divulgatio*) of the *lex Christi*. The fullness of Christ's body depends upon the missional catholicity of the Church.

Of course, as discussed in chapter 1, just as the Church as a spiritual way of life cannot exist without governance and ecclesiastical power (section 1.2.2), so too the Church's spiritual *ratio missionum* bears with it elements of such governance and power. By highlighting the former, I do not intend to downplay the latter, nor do I intend to dismiss the ways that the Church may have been, either consciously or unconsciously, a promoter and beneficiary of imperial expansion,

[12] *Defensio fidei* 1.4.8 (*Op.* 24, 20A): *Si Ecclesiam per totum orbem diffusam non habet Christus . . . nimium pauper factus est.*

an adequate treatment of which is beyond the scope of this chapter.[13] Instead, this chapter seeks to explore not the missions themselves and all the complex, ethical questions which were raised by their establishment, but rather the *theological* foundation of the missions, which Suárez argues is the *catholicity* of the body of Christ, the Christological *ratio missionum*, as it were.[14]

3.2. Catholicity in Suárez's *De Ecclesia*

While Suárez devotes a significant amount of space to the question of ecclesial unity and membership in his *De Ecclesia* (1580s), his treatment of catholicity inhabits only two small parts of the treatise.[15] Suárez equates catholicity with "universality"[16] and distinguishes four ways in which the Church is universal: as to place, persons, time, and doctrine. These four aspects of catholicity were widely recognized by other authors,[17] though Suárez of course adds his own unique touches. Suárez supports each aspect of catholicity with scriptural and patristic citations. He does not hierarchize the first three kinds of catholicity in their relations to each other, but he does deem the fourth kind, universality of

[13] Ronnie Po-chia Hsia, "Introduction," in *A Companion to Early Modern Catholic Global Missions*, ed. Ronnie Po-chia Hsia (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 2, admits that "the global history of Catholic missions revolves around one question: was Catholic evangelization a part of European colonial and imperial expansion or was it carried through on a different institutional impetus with different goals from conquest, subjugation, and incorporation?" As might be expected, Hsia admits that the answer to this question is as multidimensional as the missions themselves. As I will argue, Suárez's thought is not divorced from European colonial and imperial expansion, but it also very clearly evidences the "different goals" of which Hsia speaks.

[14] Such a foundation can then serve as, among other things, a norm by which to judge the various actions of early modern missionaries, determining to what extent those actions conform to the *ratio missionum* Suárez establishes.

[15] Suárez treats catholicity in *De fide* 9.7.5 (*Op.* 12, 271A–72B) and *De fide* 9.9.5 (*Op.* 12, 276B–77A).

[16] *De fide* 9.7.5 (*Op.* 12, 271B): *nam esse Catholicam, idem est ac esse universalem.*

[17] See, for example, Bañez, *Commentaria in secundam secundae*, col. 115–16: *Ecclesia quidem dicitur catholica, quia . . . universos homines amplectatur, si salutem assequi volunt. . . . Et hinc dicitur catholica & universalis ratione loci. . . . Dicitur etiam universalis ratione temporis. . . . Tandem, dicitur Ecclesia catholica & universalis ex parte doctrine fidei, que universaliter est vera, nullumque errorem admixtum continet, aut continere potest*; Valencia, *Analysis fidei Catholicae*, 133–35: *Nam primum Catholica dicitur ab universitate eius doctrinae, quam profitetur . . . [a]b universitate loci. . . . Dicitur quoque Ecclesia Catholica a temporis universitate. . . . Dicitur denique Ecclesia Catholica, id est, universalis, quoniam ad eam homines universi, cuiuscunq [sic]; sint sexus, aut aetatis, aut conditionis, convocantur*; Robert Bellarmine, S.J., *De controversiis Christianae fidei adversus huius temporis hæreticos* (Venice: Joannem Malachinum, 1721), vol. 2, controversy 2, bk. 4, ch. 7, 87E: *Ecclesia enim vere Catholica non solum debet amplecti omnia tempora, sed etiam omnia loca, omnes nationes, omnia hominum genera.*

doctrine, to be the "most proper" meaning of catholicity. We will return to this last point.

Suárez begins his account with the universality of place. He explains that the Church is universal because she is "diffused throughout the whole world,"[18] a position he later attributes to Augustine.[19] Suárez qualifies that this kind of catholicity does not require that the Church already occupy the whole world, but that "it suffices to have been introduced almost (*fere*) throughout the whole world, and that there be no region of the world of which some part of the Church does not contain a portion." The world was bigger for early moderns than for their predecessors, and Suárez knew that the Church did not yet occupy every region and people. He thus avoids overstating the fact of geographic catholicity. Nevertheless, he also knew that Catholic missionaries were very rapidly making their way to the remnant, and he includes this missionary action as part of the Church's universality of place: catholicity further pertains to the tendency present in the very nature of the Church that drives her to occupy the whole world, an inner urge that will eventually be satisfied.[20] The Church's universality of place pertains both to the fact of her presence the world over and also to her propagative nature. Suárez concludes by offering a third understanding of *universalis loco*: the Church wages war on earth, suffers in purgatory, and rejoices in heaven.[21] In other words, she inhabits not only this world, but also the world to come; she extends not only throughout time and space but throughout eternity. The Church's catholicity always bears with it an eschatological dimension.

Turning to universality with regard to persons, Suárez asserts that the Church is called catholic because "she calls absolutely all peoples and nations to herself, and she does not permit another religion with her in the whole world."[22] Suárez thus highlights both the inclusive embrace of the Church and her exclusive demands: she is a jealous mother who will embrace all and be rivaled by none.

[18] Suárez reiterates this meaning in *De fide* 9.9.5 (*Op.* 12, 276B).

[19] *De fide* 9.9.5 (*Op.* 12, 276B).

[20] *De fide* 9.7.5 (*Op.* 12, 271B): *Est autem Ecclesia universalis, primo quoad locum, quia toto orbe diffunditur. . . . Neque vero oportet ita esse Ecclesiam universalem loco, ut jam totum orbem occupaverit; satis est enim fere in totum orbem fuisse introductam, et nullam esse regionem cujus non aliqua pars Ecclesiae partem contineat; item, quia de se ita tendit ad universum orbem occupandum, ut ratio ipsa suadeat aliquando fore ut totum occupet.*

[21] *De fide* 9.7.5 (*Op.* 12, 271B): *Ab aliis praeterea consideratur Ecclesia universalis quoad locum, quia in terra militans, in parte inferni purgans, in coelo est triumphans.* This understanding of *universalis loci* is sparse among Suárez's contemporaries.

[22] *De fide* 9.7.5 (*Op.* 12, 271B): *Secundo* universalis *dicitur* quoad personas*, quia omnes omnino gentes et nationes ad se vocat, neque aliam religionem secum in universo orbe permittit, in quo differt maxime a synagoga.* Based on the passages Suárez invokes to defend this claim, the way in which the Church differs from the synagogue is primarily in the first clause, namely, that she calls absolutely all peoples and nations to herself.

This exclusivity, of course, does not of itself preclude the contributions of diverse cultures to the Church's catholicity. Nevertheless, Suárez does not explore such possibilities here. Rather, the Jesuit reaffirms St. Paul's teaching that the ecclesial *societas* is not bound by regnal borders, but has the capacity to embrace all persons as her own. Further, Suárez does not include here any spiritual diversity among ecclesial persons. He does recognize diverse spiritual orders and duties among the faithful, particularly as regards the clergy, but he does not associate this diversity with catholicity per se in the *De Ecclesia*.[23] Such diversity will become a key feature in his later writings.

After briefly stating a third form of catholicity, that the Church has endured throughout all of history, from the time of Adam and Eve to the present,[24] Suárez moves on to the "most proper" (*propriissime*) definition of the Church's catholicity: she is universal by reason of her doctrine.[25] Doctrine is determined not by the private judgment of each member of the faithful, but "is founded on universal consensus and the common and general rule of faith . . . and also because it is received by perpetual and universal tradition."[26] He attributes this position to Augustine and reiterates the importance of "universal consensus" that we discussed in chapter 1, a consensus neither divorced from nor reduced to the pope, but born from the supernatural union and life of the ecclesial body, head and members.[27] This consensus, which is the common faith (*communis fides*) of the members of the Church in every age, attests to her synchronic and diachronic universality.

Suárez then adds another layer of meaning to universality of doctrine: "the doctrine of the Church is catholic because it clearly and perfectly embraces all dogmas which ought to be made known to human beings, concerning things

[23] See *De fide* 9.5.3 (*Op.* 12, 261A): *[C]omparat Ecclesiam corpori humano, quod heterogeneum est, quia sicut in hoc sunt membra diversa ad varias actiones ordinata, ita in ea Ecclesia*; and *De fide* 9.9.10 (*Op.* 12, 278A): *Octava ratio [hanc numero atque in individuo esse veram Ecclesiam] sumi potest ex optimo ordine et gubernatione Ecclesiae; probatum enim supra est, in sect. 5, veram Christi Ecclesiam esse corpus organicum et optime compositum, membrisque distinctum et ordinatum.*

[24] *De fide* 9.7.5 (*Op.* 12, 271B): *Tertio dicitur Catholica tempore, quia omnibus durat temporibus.* Suárez then directs his reader to his discussion of the perpetuity of the Church in *De fide* 9.3 (*Op.* 12, 255B). See also chapter 1, section 1.2.1. In *De fide* 9.9.5 (*Op.* 12, 276B), Suárez also attributes this duration to the continuous succession of popes.

[25] Suárez's student, Gregory of Valencia, *Analysis fidei Catholicae*, 133, lists universality of doctrine as his first definition of catholicity.

[26] *De fide* 9.7.5 (*Op.* 12, 271B–72A): *Dicitur autem Ecclesiae doctrina Catholica et universalis, tum quia non privato uniuscujusque judicio nititur, sed universali consensu, et communi generalique regula fidei fundatur . . . tum etiam quia perpetua et universali traditione recepta est.* For Suárez's teaching on tradition, see Antonio Vargas-Muchaca, "Escritura, tradición e iglesia como reglas de fe según Francisco Suárez," PhD diss., University of Granada, 1967.

[27] *De fide* 9.9.5 (*Op.* 12, 276B–77A). See also chapter 1, section 1.2.3.

visible and invisible, the things of heaven and the things of earth. Likewise because in it is contained every kind of virtue, the remedy against vices and all sins."[28] Thus he goes beyond some of his contemporaries in affirming not only that catholicity of doctrine excludes all errors, but that it also embraces all saving truths people need to know, both speculative and practical.[29] Thils suggests that this position deviates from the Scriptures and the Fathers and indicates a certain, apologetic opportunism (*opportunisme*) before his Protestant interlocutors: he chooses a definition of catholicity which he knows his opponents do not hold. What Thils overlooks, though, is that Suárez adopts this understanding of catholicity almost verbatim from the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem and therefore he cannot be said to deviate from the Fathers.[30] The charge of opportunism may tenuously hold, but is lessened both by the fact that he is drawing on a patristic source and by the fact that students at the Collegio Romano, not Protestants, are his immediate audience in the 1580s.[31]

At least three points can be drawn from the foregoing exposition. First, Suárez's treatment of catholicity in his 1580s *De Ecclesia* shows that he understands this mark of the Church in various ways. The first three ways—universality of place, persons, and time—are not hierarchized, while the fourth, universality of doctrine, is given pride of place. Second, at this point, Suárez's understanding of catholicity entails a diversity of persons and nations, but he does not explain whether this diversity as such contributes to the Church's catholicity. In other words, he leaves the question unanswered whether in embracing all human beings, catholicity draws them into a uniformity, or affirms and incorporates the diverse gifts and customs that peoples and nations bring to the Church. Finally,

[28] *De fide* 9.7.5 (*Op.* 12, 272A): *[T]um denique, ut ex eodem Cyrillo* [*Hierosolymitano, catechesis ultima*], *ibid., colligitur, doctrina Ecclesiae catholica est, quia plane et perfecte omnia dogmata, quae in notitia hominum pervenire debent, de visibilibus et invisibilibus, de coelestibus atque terrenis complectitur. Item quia in ea omne genus virtutis continetur, adversum vitia et contra peccata omnia remedium invenitur.*

[29] See, for example, Bañez, *Commentaria in secundam secundae*, col. 116: *Tandem, dicitur Ecclesia catholica & universalis ex parte doctrine fidei, que universaliter est vera, nullumque errorem admixtum continet, aut continere potest.*

[30] Suárez references Cyril of Jerusalem's *Catechesis,* lecture 18, no. 23, the Greek text and Latin translation of which can be found in *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris: Migne, 1857), vol. 33, col. 1044. For the sake of comparison with Suárez's text, I give here the Latin translation of Cyril: *Catholica enimvero [seu universalis] vocatur . . . quia universe et absque defectu docet omnia quae in hominum notitiam venire debent dogmata, sive de visibilibus et invisibilibus, sive de coelestibus et terrestribus rebus.*

[31] Thils, *Les notes de l'Église*, 222–23: *La mise en oeuvre de l'universalité doctrinale, comme note de l'Église, découle du caractère apologétique de la Defensio fidei.* Thils can hardly be blamed for this misidentification. He undoubtedly was aware that Suárez spoke of doctrinal universality in his *De Ecclesia.* Yet Thils's work was published in 1937, two years before Spanedda established the dating of the *De Ecclesia* in the early 1580s, not 1617 (and therefore *not* after the publication of the *Defensio fidei* in 1613), as Thils presumes.

the missional aspect of catholicity is present though underdeveloped in the *De Ecclesia*. Suárez checks any overstatement of the fact of the Church's geographic universality, but this move prompts him to recognize the ecclesial urge to propagate as an aspect of catholicity. Decades later, Suárez will develop this missional catholicity further when he is penning his *Defensio fidei* at the same time he is writing a defense of his own missionary order, the Society of Jesus.

3.3. Catholicity in Suárez's *Defensio fidei* and *De religione*

3.3.1. Introduction

Ideas tend to receive more attention when their meaning is called into question. When King James I of England referred to himself as the "defender of the catholic faith" in 1609, Suárez proceeded to devote five chapters of his *Defensio fidei* to defending Rome's sole claim to the name "catholic" and to defining the meaning of her catholicity.[32] The argument is simple: if Suárez can prove that the "Anglican sect" does not possess catholicity, then he can prove that James I is no "defender" of the catholic faith, thereby delegitimizing the oath of allegiance.[33] Suárez sees little difference between defending the catholicity of the *faith* and defending that of the *Church*, since "the Church could be called Catholic because it professes the catholic faith, or the faith can be called catholic because it is retained and handed on by the Catholic Church." He continues:

> Yet one thing is certain, that is, that these two are joined in such a way that they cannot be separated from each other, since neither can the catholic faith exist outside of the true Church, not can the Catholic Church exist without true faith, for wherever the Catholic Church exists, there also will be the catholic faith, and vice versa, and therefore we will always use such terms indifferently.[34]

[32] *Defensio fidei* 1.12.1 (*Op.* 24, 61A–B). Suárez treats catholicity in *Defensio fidei* 1.12–16 (*Op.* 24, 61A–85B). The "Premonition" of James I was added in 1609 to the Oath of Allegiance of 1606. In the opening lines, James refers to himself as the "professour, maintainer, and defender of the trew, christian, catholique, and apostolique faith." See *The Political Works of James I*, ed. Charles Howard McIlwain (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918), 110.

[33] *Defensio fidei* 1.12.1 (*Op.* 24, 61B): *[S]i ostenderimus, illam non esse catholicam fidem, convincemus etiam illum non esse defensorem catholicae fidei.*

[34] *Defensio fidei* 1.12.2 (*Op.* 24, 61B): *[P]otuit enim Ecclesia vocari Catholica, quia fidem catholicam profitetur, et e contrario fides potest dici catholica, quia ab Ecclesia Catholica retinetur et traditur. . . . Unum autem certum est, scilicet, illa duo ita esse conjuncta, ut separari nequeant, quia nec fides catholica esse potest extra veram Ecclesiam, nec Catholica Ecclesia sine vera fide, nam ubi Ecclesia Catholica fuerit, erit etiam catholica fides, et e contrario, et ideo semper de illis indifferenter loquemur.*

This statement should come as no surprise given our analysis in the two preceding chapters: faith is the form of the Church, and wherever faith exists, there too is the Catholic Church. Here Suárez adds catholicity to the mix: wherever the *catholic* faith exists, there, too, is the Catholic Church.

Suárez divides his defense of the Church's catholicity into two arguments. He devotes two chapters to argue that only the Church of Rome properly inherits the *name* "catholic." He then devotes the final three chapters to defend the "reality or property [of catholicity] signified by the name."[35] We will look only briefly at his first argument (3.3.2) before devoting the rest of this chapter to his second, which can be divided into four different kinds of catholicity: fullness of faith, a universal *ratio credenda* (3.3.3), a diversity of persons and orders (3.3.4), and a universality of place (3.3.5).

3.3.2. What's in a Name: The "Name Itself" of Catholicity

According to Suárez, the adjective "catholic" properly applies to the Church of Rome primarily on account of antiquity, since the name "catholic" has been attributed to the true Church from her beginning and persists to the present day.[36] In every age the Church has merited the moniker "catholic," distinguishing herself from imposters by her uninterrupted succession.[37] The name "catholic" is a family name (*cognomen*), according to Suárez, whose genealogy is the history of the Church. Quoting Pacianus (310–391), who uses the name to distinguish himself from Marcionites, Novatian, and other "heretics," Suárez writes that, "Christian is my name, but Catholic is my surname."[38] And both names proclaim Christ. Suárez closely links the names "Christian" and "Catholic," for to be a Christian is to be joined to the Catholic Church. He notes that the heretics of his time often take the name of their leader: Lutherans, Calvinists, etc. Yet, in the words of Athanasius (296/8–373), "whoever come into the Church from among the nations do not take on the name of those catechizing or handing on the rudiments of the faith, but rather they take on the name of the Savior, and they begin to be called Christians instead of Gentiles," a name that numbers them within the Catholic Church, Christ's mystical body, according to Suárez.[39]

[35] *Defensio fidei* 1.12.1 (*Op.* 24, 61B).

[36] *Defensio fidei* 1.12.3 (*Op.* 24, 62A): *Ergo ab Apostolorum tempore cum ipso symbolo nomen etiam Catholicae semper Ecclesia conservavit. . . . Ergo multo majori admiratione dignum est, quod usque ad nostra tempora conservatum fuerit, et eidem Ecclesiae ac fidei attributum.*

[37] *Defensio fidei* 1.12.6 (*Op.* 24, 63A).

[38] *Defensio fidei* 1.12.4 (*Op.* 24, 62B): *Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero cognomen.*

[39] *Defensio fidei* 1.12.15 (*Op.* 24, 66B): *Nam qui ex gentibus ad Ecclesiam veniunt, non catechizantium, seu fidei rudimenta tradentium nomina, sed Salvatoris in se transferunt, et pro gentilibus Christiani incipiunt appellari.* Suárez attributes this quotation to Athanasius' second oration against the Arians.

Of course, the most important part of Suárez's argument for the Church's catholicity is the substance behind the name "catholic," the reality which he claims the Church of Rome possesses and the Anglican "sect" does not. Yet while the source of the name "catholic" lies in the *res*, Suárez nevertheless begins his argument by defending the name itself (*nomen ipsum*), which, he thinks, speaks in some way to the presence of the *res*. In other words, for Suárez, the argument that the Church of Rome has been called Catholic from antiquity up to his own day does not merely prove a consistent, extrinsic denomination ultimately independent of whether the Church of Rome actually possesses the *res* of catholicity. Extrinsic denomination is not a "mere matter of naming," in the words of John P. Doyle, but is "rooted in things themselves";[40] a defense of the name is therefore a preliminary defense of the presence of the thing itself.[41] If the Church of Rome never possessed the *name itself* of catholicity, it would be improbable that she possessed the *reality* of catholicity. Equally improbable is the idea that a name could be misappropriated, both internally and externally, for over one thousand years. Suárez acknowledges that imposters can claim the name "catholic" for themselves. Yet the world does not recognize them by the name "catholic," and thus they accept the name only "timidly and with blushing," whereas true Catholics receive the name "as if by hereditary right, and they are everywhere called by that name, and through it are recognized by all."[42] For Suárez, the fact that the Church of Rome enjoys the uninterrupted privilege of the name "catholic" speaks to the presence of this reality within her. Unabashedly, she has borne this name on her standard for ages, and all peoples have come to acknowledge her by such a name. This argument, of course, only makes the *res* of catholicity "more evident" (*evidentius*) and still requires further proof.[43] Nevertheless, the defense of the name itself is an indispensable preamble to the case for catholicity.

It actually appears in Athanasius, *Adversus Arianos oratio prima*, 3, in *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris: Garnier, 1857), vol. 26, col. 17–18.

[40] John P. Doyle, "Prolegomena to a Study of Extrinsic Denomination in the Work of Francisco Suárez, S.J.," in *Collected Studies on Francisco Suárez, S.J. (1548–1617)*, ed. Victor M. Salas (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2010), 124, 133.

[41] *Defensio fidei* 1.12.6 (*Op.* 24, 63A–B).

[42] *Defensio fidei* 1.13.4 (*Op.* 24, 69A–B): *Non est ergo mirum, quod hodie etiam Protestantes catholicum nomen usurpant. . . . Tanta vero est vis veritatis, ut etiam ipsi haeretici non nisi timide et cum rubore Catholicorum nomen ausi fuerint sibi arrogare. . . . Quod longe aliter in veris Catholicis observatur; non enim Catholicorum nomen sibi ipsi assumunt, sed ab ipsa fide antiqua, quam profitentur, quasi haereditario jure illud recipiunt, et ita illo nomine ubique appellantur, et per illud ab omnibus cognoscuntur.*

[43] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.1 (*Op.* 24, 69B).

3.3.3. Catholicity of Doctrine: What to Believe and Why

Suárez devotes the next three chapters of the *Defensio fidei* to defending the property of catholicity by detailing the "reason behind the name" (*ratio nominis*).[44] Suárez equates "catholicity" with "universality," adding that this equation is affirmed by everyone, even his opponents. What lies in question is "what kind of universality is required in the Church or the faith by the meaning of the term."[45] Suárez is now concerned with the *res ipsa*, the reality itself of catholicity that is signified by the meaning of the name (*ex vi illius nominis*). Suárez has no intention of being reductive here. He recognizes that there is no single meaning of universality handed on by the Church, but that catholicity bespeaks a "manifold universality" (*multiplex universalitas*).[46] Nevertheless, Suárez argues that each form of catholicity can be found in the true faith and Church, and that each form is lacking in the sect of the Anglicans.

The *Defensio* begins with a treatment of the catholicity of doctrine. While much of the substance of the treatment of this matter in the *Defensio* is similar to that in the *De Ecclesia*, Suárez structures the *Defensio* differently. First, Suárez does not attribute to doctrinal catholicity the pride of place that he gave it earlier. This honor, as we shall see, now goes to geographic catholicity. Second, he more starkly distinguishes between the two forms of doctrinal catholicity conflated in the *De Ecclesia*: a universality of matter (all the dogmas to be believed) and a universality of *ratio* and *regula credendi.*

Suárez argues that the faith is catholic first "on account of the matter of the faith, that is, because it certainly embraces without diminution or partition all dogmas pertaining to true faith in God."[47] Surprisingly, this idea is not attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, as previously done in the *De Ecclesia*, but to the Donatists, who argued that universality speaks not to communion throughout the whole world but to the observation of all the divine precepts and sacraments. Suárez, following Augustine, refutes the Donatist rejection of geographic catholicity but recognizes that the Donatists proclaim the truth of doctrinal catholicity. Not everything that heretics utter is heresy; still more, the truths they speak "redound to the favor of the Catholic Church, since she alone retains the whole truth." The Church alone preserves all the divine sacraments and commands of Christ, and

[44] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.1 (*Op.* 24, 69B).

[45] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.1 (*Op.* 24, 69B): *Tota [controversia] ergo constitui potest in explicando, quae universalitas in Ecclesia vel fide ex vi illius nominis requiratur.*

[46] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.1 (*Op.* 24, 69B).

[47] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.2 (*Op.* 24, 70A): *Primo ergo dici potest fides universalis ex parte materiae, quia nimirum omnia dogmata ad veram Dei fidem pertinentia sine diminutione seu partitione complectitur.*

she teaches and believes them according to his spirit.[48] These claims are further rooted in Christ, who through the gift of charity enables the Church to be holy and fulfill all of his commands, if not in each particular member, at least in the whole body (*ipso corpori Ecclesiae Catholicae*).[49]

The second form of doctrinal catholicity is the Church's universal "reason (*ratio*) for believing and her rule (*regula*)."[50] The *ratio* and *regula* of the Church is ultimately Christological, as it is "the divine truth itself or . . . the word of God" communicated to men in Christ Jesus and continually made manifest in the living rule of the Church.[51] Yet how does Suárez defend this as a form of *catholicity*? After inheriting the first form of doctrinal catholicity from Donatists, one would expect him to reference a more orthodox authority. Far from it, he concedes that this meaning of the word "catholic" cannot be found in the Fathers! Yet its meaning is not opposed to the other forms of catholicity which the Fathers do express. In fact, other meanings of catholicity—of matter, of persons, and of place and time—cannot be maintained without a universality of *ratio* and *regula*.[52] Aquinas makes a similar distinction with regard to faith, namely that the matter of faith depends upon the formal *ratio* of the faith, or that whereby the matter of faith is believed.[53] But Aquinas never explicitly claims this formal *ratio* as a type of the Church's *catholicity* even if it could be implied, as Suárez deems to be the case in the Fathers. Suárez's contribution to the preceding tradition, then, is explicitly to connect the *ratio credendi* with the mark of catholicity. And this is perhaps why Suárez treats doctrinal catholicity before other kinds of catholicity in the *Defensio fidei*: he recognizes that other kinds of catholicity cannot

[48] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.2 (*Op.* 24, 70A): *nihil impedire, imo etiam in favorem Ecclesiae Catholicae redundare, quia illa sola est quae integram veritatem retinet, et omnia divina sacramenta a Christo instituta conservat, et juxta illius spiritum docet ac credit. Dici etiam potest observare omnia divina mandata . . . in ordine ad fidem.*

[49] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.2 (*Op.* 24, 70A).

[50] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.4 (*Op.* 24, 70B): *Secundo requiritur in vera fide universalitas, seu communitas ex parte rationis credendi, et ex parte regulae.*

[51] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.4 (*Op.* 24, 70B). See chapter 1, section 1.2.3.

[52] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.4 (*Op.* 24, 70B): *Quanquam enim Patres expresse hanc etymologiam illius vocis non attingant, nihilominus non est improbanda, quia non est contraria aliis proprietatibus, ver universalitatibus ab eis in illa voce consideratis, imo in eis virtute continetur, neque enim potest esse fides universalis quoad materiam, personas, loca et tempora, nisi etiam rationem et regulam credendi universalem et communem, seu publicam sortiatur.*

[53] *ST* II-II, q. 1, a. 1, *corpus*: *Respondeo dicendum quod cuiuslibet cognoscitivi habitus obiectum duo habet, scilicet id quod materialiter cognoscitur, quod est sicut materiale obiectum; et id per quod cognoscitur, quod est formalis ratio obiecti. . . . [I]n fide, si consideremus formalem rationem obiecti, nihil est aliud quam veritas prima, non enim fides de qua loquimur assentit alicui nisi quia est a Deo revelatum; unde ipsi veritati divinae innititur tanquam medio*. *ST* II-II, q. 5, a. 3, *corpus*: *[H]aereticus qui discredit unum articulum fidei non habet habitum fidei neque formatae neque informis. Cuius ratio est quia species cuiuslibet habitus dependet ex formali ratione obiecti, qua sublata, species habitus remanere non potest.*

be maintained without a universal *ratio* and *regula*. Lacking these, faith and religion lose the uniformity that ensures catholicity;[54] they would be left to private judgment rather than to "a universal, common, and public rule of believing."[55] It is noteworthy that Suárez is not reducing catholicity to uniformity in *all* things; he is only affirming that *some* type of uniformity is necessary in order to facilitate *other* forms of catholicity. Diversity is praiseworthy only if it is symphonic rather than cacophonous; diffusion is a mark of pride only if the thing diffused is not dissipated. What keeps the symphony from cacophony and the diffusion from dissipation is the fact that a single, identical rule of faith is shared by all who are fully Christian, namely, that according to which they believe what God has revealed.

In his *De religione*, Suárez shows very clearly that the uniformity of faith necessary for catholicity does not negate a diversity of liturgical expression of faith. When discussing the feasts of the Church, the Jesuit asks whether some regional variety may be permitted. "Although the Church is one," he explains, "and therefore in substantial and principal rites and festivities preserves unity, it is not contrary to this unity that she has variety in some secondary ceremonies. This variety even pertains to her beauty."[56] A diverse unity does not detract from the beauty of the bride but displays that beauty all the more. In the case of local feast days, this beauty arises from the diverse devotions of the faithful throughout the world within a uniformity of what faith believes and why. As demonstrated in chapter 2, here again we see how a single form (faith) can give rise to diverse manifestations.

Suárez regards as licit even limited variety within some of the most fundamental acts of Christian life such as baptism and the Eucharist. A few chapters later in the *De religione*, he notes that Greek priests traveling through lands held by the Latin Church are not bound to observe the rites of the Latin Church (and vice versa for Latin priests in Greek territories), particularly with regard to the bread consecrated. Greeks use leavened bread and Latins unleavened, and both are permitted to maintain their custom; uniformity of the liturgical expression

[54] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.4 (*Op.* 24, 71A): *[N]on potest esse fides uniformis, ut sic dicam, seu eadem in omnibus fidelibus, nisi omnes in eadem communi regula credendi conveniant; ergo ut fides possit esse catholica, necesse est ut sit universalis, etiam in regula et ratione credendi.* See also *De legibus* 10.6.8 (*Op.* 6, 582A): *[H]aec Ecclesia semper debet esse una, et ideo observare etiam debet uniformitatem, non solum in fide, sed etiam in religione exteriori, et in substantialibus ritibus suis, quia . . . non potest aliter humana congregatio in unum corpus religionis conjungi.*

[55] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.4 (*Op.* 24, 70B). Suárez states that among the sect of the English, *unusquisque sibi est regula. Defensio fidei* 1.14.5 (*Op.* 24, 71A).

[56] *De religione* 2.2.11.1 (*Op.* 13, 294A): *Quamvis Ecclesia una sit, et ideo in substantialibus et principalibus ritibus, ac festivitatibus unitatem servet, non est contra unitatem ejus, quod in aliquibus secundariis caeremoniis varietatem habeat, imo haec varietas pertinet ad pulchritudinem ejus.*

of faith need not be maintained even within a given region. As Suárez explains in the *De sacramentis*, neither type of bread is "absolutely necessary for the sacrament in this or that Church, Greek or Latin. . . . Besides, it is erroneous to say that the sacraments have a different essence in different parts of the Church."[57] Suárez articulates here the importance of maintaining the "essence" of the sacrament while allowing variation on secondary matters in different "parts" of the Church. As noted in the previous chapter,[58] Suárez makes a similar argument with regard to the baptismal formula of the Greek Church. The Greeks, unlike the Latins, do not express the person of the minister in their baptismal formula, which is rendered into Latin: *Baptizetur N[omen] seu servus Christi in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.* Suárez writes that although many have doubted the truth of baptism handed down in this form,

> nevertheless, especially after the Council of Florence, it is certain that that form is sufficient. And indeed rightly: for the use of this form that the Greek Church has is most ancient. Whence it is credible that they received it from the holy Fathers and Catholic bishops. Nor is it credible that that whole Church has lacked true baptism, otherwise it would have lacked all the rest of the sacraments, and true priests and bishops, which is absurd and contrary to the judgment of the universal Roman Church. For when Greeks return to obedience to the Roman Church from schism, neither are they baptized again, nor, if they are priests or bishops, are they ordained or consecrated again, but they are received in their own degree and order.[59]

Again, he emphasizes a unity of substance and form amid linguistic variations. In the following section, he goes even further by arguing that, because each form is valid, a Latin priest could efficaciously confer baptism with the

[57] *De sacramentis* 44.3.9 (*Op.* 20, 811B–12A): *Ex quo intelligitur, erroneum etiam esse, dicere alterutrum panem esse simpliciter de necessitate sacramenti in hac vel in illa Ecclesia, Graeca aut Latina, nam et ratio facta, et testimonia adducta aeque probant de omni Ecclesia; praeterquam quod erroneum est dicere sacramenta habere alias essentias, in una parte Ecclesiae, ac in alia.*

[58] Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.

[59] *De sacramentis* 21.1.4 (*Op.* 20, 350B): *Nam licet multi dubitaverint de veritate baptismi sub hac forma traditi . . . tamen post Concilium præcipue Florentinum, certum est, illam formam esse sufficientem. Et quidem merito; nam Ecclesia Græca habet usum illius formæ antiquissimum. Unde credibile est a sanctis Patribus et Episcopis Catholicis illum accepisse. Neque est credibile, totam illam Ecclesiam caruisse vero baptismate, alioqui reliquis sacramentis omnibus, verisque sacerdotibus, ac Episcopis caruisset, quod est absurdum, et contra id quod universa Ecclesia Romana sentit. Nam quando Graeci a schismate ad obedientiam Romanae Ecclesiae redeunt, nec baptizantur iterum, nec si sacrdotes, vel Episcopi sint, iterum ordinantur, ac consecrantur, sed in suo gradu, et ordine recipiuntur.*

Greek formula. And he argues this on the basis of a single essence universally observed by the Church:

> For the essence of the sacrament is one in the universal Church. Hence, the form which suffices for constituting the sacrament in one part [of the Church], suffices in any part or region of the Church, because it pertains to the necessity of the sacrament. If therefore in the Greek Church it is not necessary to express the person of the minister, also in the Latin Church it will not be necessary for the sacrament, since a precept or custom of the Church cannot change the essence of a sacrament.[60]

For Suárez, doctrinal universality allows for regional and ritual diversity, but never at the expense of substantial or essential unity. Faith's content and the reason for embracing that content must remain substantially one lest the *societas* of the Church be dissolved into a mere aggregate of disparate parts expressing nothing common and therefore nothing universal.

3.3.4. Catholicity of Persons: A Queen Bedecked in Variety

After describing two forms of doctrinal catholicity in the *Defensio fidei*, Suárez proceeds to delineate a third form of catholicity: the faith or Church is catholic because "it is universal with respect to all degrees and orders of persons."[61] Suárez attributes this understanding of catholicity to Cyril of Jerusalem and to St. Paul and considers it in two ways. The first way, which is "better known and easier to grasp," is that the Church is universal "because she is useful to all human beings of every nation, province, language, quality, or condition. Indeed, she is necessary for salvation and therefore she calls all people to herself, whether Jew or gentile, according to the teaching of St. Paul to the Colossians [3:11] . . . Christ is all and in all."[62] This description of the universality of persons is identical to

[60] *De sacramentis* 21.2.4 (*Op.* 20, 352B–53A): *Nam sacramenti essentia una est in universa Ecclesia. Unde forma, quae in una parte sufficit ad constituendum sacramentum, sufficit in qualibet parte seu regione Ecclesiae, quod attinet ad sacramenti necessitatem; si ergo in Ecclesia Graeca non est necessarium exprimere personam ministri, etiam in Ecclesia Latina id non erit de necessitate sacramenti, quia Ecclesiae praeceptum, aut consuetudo, non potest mutare essentiam sacramenti.*

[61] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.6 (*Op.* 24, 71B): *Tertio dici potest fides, seu Ecclesia Catholica, quia universalis est quoad omnes gradus et ordines personarum.*

[62] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.6 (*Op.* 24, 71B): *Unus et notior ac facilior est, quia omnibus hominibus cujuscumque nationis, provinciae, linguae, qualitatis, vel conditionis utilis est, imo et ad salutem necessaria, et ideo omnes ad se vocat sive Judaeos, sive gentiles, etc., juxta illus Pauli ad Colossen. 3: Ubi non est gentilis et Judaeus, circumcisio et praeputium, Barbarus et Scytha, servus et liber, sed omnia, et in omnibus, Christus.*

Suárez's treatment in the *De Ecclesia*. The only difference is that he quotes Cyril and St. Paul at length (rather than just listing the citations), thereby more clearly revealing the Christological basis of catholicity: the Church must be universal with regard to persons because Christ must be all and in all.

Yet, Suárez adds something further in the *Defensio fidei*: the Church is catholic with regard to persons in a second way, "for the Catholic Church ought to consist of all members and degrees, graces, and gifts with which the Apostle Paul depicts her."[63] He elaborates that because the Church is the bride of Christ "'holy and immaculate' (Eph. 5:27), that is, abounding in every kind of virtue and grace, it pertains to her beauty that she be whole and consist of every variety of members and all graces, ministries, operations, and virtues, of which Christ has wanted her to consist."[64] Unlike his earlier writings, Suárez here delineates such universality under catholicity of *persons* and, as we will see, develops this understanding of catholicity of "degrees, graces, and gifts" out of a Pauline theology of the *corpus Christi*.

Following St. Paul (Eph. 4 and 1 Cor. 12), Suárez admits a variety both of *members* and of *gifts and graces.* Such a variety of members constitutes the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which includes "bishops, priests, deacons, ministers, and the multitude of the faithful."[65] He even argues that Paul's theology of the mystical body "requires" this variety of members, which endures "in Christ until the consummation of the saints."[66] The Church's catholicity of persons thus bears an eschatological character. Such catholicity serves not only the beauty and utility of the Church, but also serves her "conservation and perfection" (*conservationem et perfectionem*).[67] In keeping with Suárez's definition of the Church discussed in chapter 1, this conservation and perfection is not of the political order, but the spiritual order, and thus requires a corresponding variety of gifts and graces from

[63] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.7 (*Op.* 24, 71B–72A): *Alter modus indicatus a Cyrillo est, quia Ecclesia Catholica debet constare ex omnibus membris et gradibus, gratiis, et donis, quibus illam depingit Apostolus Paulus.*

[64] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.7 (*Op.* 24, 72A): *Cum igitur Ecclesia sit Christi sponsa . . . sancta et immaculata, id est, omni genere virtutum et gratiarum abundans, ad ejus pulchritudinem pertinet, ut sit integra et constans ex omni varietate membrorum, et omnibus gratiis, ministeriis, operationibus et virtutibus, quibus eam Christus constare voluit.* Suárez hints at a catholicity of this kind only in passing in the *De Ecclesia* in *De fide* 9.7.5 (*Op.* 12, 272A): the Church contains "every kind of virtue." This passage, a quote from Cyril that Suárez relays without elaboration, appears under catholicity of doctrine and suggests that the Church possesses not only all dogmas of faith but all means of fighting sin.

[65] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.7 (*Op.* 24, 72A): *Certa membra sua habet Ecclesia, Episcopos, presbyteros, diaconos, ministros, et turbam fidelium.* Suárez is here citing Optatus, *Contra Parmenianum*, bk. 2.

[66] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.7 (*Op.* 24, 72A): *. . . [I]n corpore mystico Christi, ex sententia Pauli, requiri dictam membrorum varietatem, quae usque ad consummationem Sanctorum in eo est duratura.*

[67] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.7 (*Op.* 24, 72A). Emile Mersch, S.J., makes a similar point in *The Theology of the Mystical Body*, trans. Cyril Vollert, S.J. (St. Louis/London: Herder, 1951), 515: "[T]he Church cannot realize the perfection of its unity save in a magnificent variety."

the Holy Spirit. In fact, Suárez's insistence on the essentially spiritual nature of this "universality" is fundamental to his polemic against James I. While he admits that James I has preserved the ecclesiastical hierarchy under his reign, he points out that it is only a "shadow" (*umbra*) of the true hierarchy instituted by Christ.[68] Moreover, according to James's own testimony, he restored the ecclesiastical hierarchy "for the sole cause of political order,"[69] while Christ instituted it for the salvation of souls: "For the Church of Christ is not a mere political body, but a mystical body, and in some way divine, and therefore it requires a hierarchy not only for political order, but for a spiritual end, 'for the completion of the saints, in the work of ministry, in the building up of the body of Christ,' as St. Paul has said."[70] Correlatively, this spiritual end requires not a diversity of external gifts and temporal goods, but diverse gifts "according to graces, which are given diversely to us."[71] In Suárez's assessment, James has instrumentalized a divine institution for political purposes. Reaffirming what we discussed in chapter 1, Suárez states that the catholicity of the Church pertains to the spiritual and eschatological order, not to the exclusion of the political, but as the divine foundation of all ecclesial-political order.

While Suárez focuses his attention in this section on defending the episcopacy, it is nevertheless clear that the diversity of persons and gifts expressed by such catholicity extends beyond the clergy to other "ministers" and "the multitude of the faithful," all who are equipped with the necessary spiritual gifts to fulfill their duty in the Church. In the *De religione*, Suárez extends this diversity to include the many religious orders that the Church boasts. Heretics, Suárez accuses, condemn the variety of religious orders within the Church as opposed to Paul's injunction to the Corinthians to belong only to Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 3). Such religious orders allegedly introduce schisms and divisions into the Church, and compromise the unity of faith and charity that the Church enjoys.[72]

[68] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.10 (*Op.* 24, 73A): *Longe ergo diversa est illa hierarchiae umbra a veritate a Christo instituta, et a Patribus tradita.*

[69] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.10 (*Op.* 24, 73A): *politici duntaxat ordinia causa.*

[70] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.11 (*Op.* 24, 73A): *Non est enim Ecclesia Christi corpus mere politicum, sed mysticum, et quodammodo divinum, et ideo non solum propter politicum ordinem, sed propter spiritualem finem hierarchiam requirit,* ad consummationem Sanctorum, in opus ministerii in ardificationem corporis Christi, *ut Paulus dixit.*

[71] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.11 (*Op.* 24, 73A–B): *Et ideo diversitas horum membrorum et graduum non in externis dotibus, aut temporalibus bonis consistit, sed in diversis donationibus,* secundum gratias, quae datae sunt nobis differentes [Rom. 12:6].

[72] *De religione* 9.1.1.1 (*Op.* 16.1, 427A): *Haeretici, qui summo odio hunc statum prosequuntur, multitudinem ac varietatem religionum maxime damnant, ac perinde putant esse dicere, hos religiosos esse sancti Dominici, illos sancti Francisci, ac dicere:* Ego sum Pauli, ego autem Apollo, *quod reprehendit Paulus, 1 Corint. 1 et 3; quia hoc est schismata et divisiones in Ecclesiam introducere, unde videntur contendere, salva unitate fidei et charitatis, non posse hanc multiplicationem admitti.*

Suárez counters that it is "the catholic truth that the variety of religious orders pertains to the ornament and utility of the Church and to the greater service of God."[73] Suárez invokes Pope Gregory XIII's confirmation of the Society of Jesus, wherein he writes that Divine Providence produces new and various institutes in his Church "according to the needs of the times" and provides marks, distinctive characteristics, and suitable means to each "according to the vocation of their special grace."[74] As I noted in the Introduction, the *De religione* was written as a defense of the Society of Jesus against *fellow Catholics.* Suárez's argument for a legitimate diversity of religious orders indeed takes aim at the *haeretici*, but it also levels a blow against those Catholics whose criticism of the Society compelled him to write the *De religione* in the first place.[75] That Suárez may have such in mind is apparent from his invocation of a papal constitution, which would have little clout against the *haeretici*, but much force to silence any Catholic dissenters. We will return to these themes of spiritual variety and Suárez's defense of his own order in chapter 4.

The reasons for such variety of religious in the Church are manifold. First, the religious state is a most useful way for people to acquire *perfection*, that is, salvation and the life of charity.[76] Yet, on account of the "various constitutions and propensities of men, one religious order and one mode of living could not be accommodated to all."[77] Therefore, some orders exist for contemplation, others for action, still others profess a mixed life of contemplation and action; some orders aim toward solitary life, others toward communal life; some orders exercise manual labor, others academic and spiritual labor. This vast variety exists in order that "all may have a way to be able to choose what is more expedient for them" and that all may be cared for according to their needs.[78] Suárez's first reason thus arises from the universality of persons whom the Church embraces

[73] *De religione* 9.1.1.2 (*Op.* 16.1, 427B): *Nihilominus veritas catholica est, varietatem religionum, ad decorem et utilitatem Ecclesiae maiusque Dei obsequium pertinere.*

[74] *De religione* 9.1.1.2 (*Op.* 16.1, 428A): *Cum divina providentia, pro temporum necessitate, varia et salutaria ordinum instituta in Ecclesia sua produxerit . . . juxta cujuslibet peculiaris gratiae vocationem, peculiaris quasdam notas, peculiaria insignia, et opportuna ad finem, quem intendunt, media suggesserit.*

[75] Doris Moreno, "Crear opinion: el dominico Alonso de Avendaño y su predicación antijesuita (1567–1596)," in *Identidades y fronteras culturales en el mundo ibérico de la Edad Moderna*, ed. José Luis Beltrán, Bernat Hernández, and Doris Moreno (Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 2016), 402; Raoul de Scorraille, *François Suarez de la Compagnie de Jésus*, vol. 2 (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1912–1913), 139. See also section I.3 of the Introduction, and the introduction to chapter 4.

[76] *De religione* 9.1.1.13 (*Op.* 16.1, 431A).

[77] *De religione* 9.1.1.12 (*Op.* 16.1, 431A): *Ratio penetrabilis est, quia status religionum proponitur hominibus tanquam via utilissima ad perfectionem acquirendam; fieri autem non poterat, moraliter loquendo, ut una religio unusque vivendi modus omnibus accommodaretur, propter varias hominum complexiones ac propensiones.*

[78] *De religione* 9.1.1.12 (*Op.* 16.1, 431A).

by her catholicity. Universality of persons demands a wide variety of modes of life suited to such persons, propensities, and, ultimately, to their particular needs for salvation. In this way, the Church is "useful to all human beings."

A second reason for the variety of religious orders is rooted in the Church's universal mission: "From the intention of the Holy Spirit, religious orders are not solely instituted for the good of those who are gathered in them, but also that through them others, and even the universal Church, may be helped."[79] Religious orders embrace various actions and ministries, and no one order can do everything. Therefore, "from the variety of actions and ministries arises a plenitude of ministers who can assist the Church in every way and in every kind of action."[80] Invoking Psalm 44 in reference to the Church, Suárez writes that she is a "queen bedecked in variety" and exposits the passage with the commentary of St. Bernard: "It is no wonder if in this exile, with the Church on pilgrimage, there is a plural unity and a united plurality of this kind, because likewise in the Fatherland, when she herself will reign, there will be a differing equality, since it is written, 'In my Father's house are many mansions.'"[81] Here Suárez subtly introduces an eschatological element: not only does the diverse unity of the Church serve her earthly mission, but it also reflects the heavenly reality in which the saints diversely experience the vision of God.[82] As Dante writes of the souls in Paradise, "Differing voices make sweet music. / Just so our differing ranks in this our life / create sweet harmony among these wheels."[83] The diversity of religious orders on earth thus accentuates the Church's eschatological orientation in addition to serving her twofold purpose of the salvation of those within the Church and the Church's universal mission to all people.

[79] *De religione* 9.1.1.12 (*Op.* 16.1, 431A): *Alia ratio etiam valde generalis est, quia religiones ex intentione Spiritus Sancti non solum institutae sunt ad bonum eorum qui in eis congregantur, sed etiam ut per eos alii, atque adeo universa Ecclesia juvetur.*

[80] *De religione* 9.1.1.12 (*Op.* 16.1, 431A): *[Q]uia ergo variae sunt actiones et ministeria in quibus possunt religiones Ecclesiae inservire, et non sufficit una pro omnibus actionibus, ideo ex earum varietate consurgit plenitudo ministrorum, qui possint omnibus modis, et in omni actionum genere Ecclesiam juvare.* "Plenitude" becomes a focal point for later understandings of catholicity. See Dulles, *The Catholicity of the Church*, 68, 158, 167.

[81] *De religione* 9.1.1.12 (*Op.* 16.1, 431A–B): Astitit regina a dextris tuis in vestitu deaurato, circumdata varietate: Ne mirum (*[Bernardus] inquit*) si in hoc exilio, peregrinante Ecclesia, sit hujusmodi pluralis unitas, et una pluralitas, cum in illa quoque patria, quando et ipsa regnabit, futura sit aliqua dispar aequalitas, cum scriptum sit: In domo patris mei mansiones multae sunt.

[82] *De religione* 9.1.1.7 (*Op.* 16.1, 429B): *Sicut dicimus, Beatos distingui in essentiali beatitudine, quia in re illa, in qua est substantia beatitudinis, habent aliquam varietatem, licet in rigore diversitas illa specifica aut essentialis non sit.*

[83] Dante, *Paradiso*, trans. Robert Hollander and Jean Hollander (New York: Anchor, 2007), VI.124–26.

If we return to the *Defensio fidei*, we find a common twofold purpose in Suárez's description of the catholicity of the Church. As mentioned, the diversity of spiritual orders within the Church not only beautifies but necessarily conserves and perfects (*conservationem et perfectionem*) the Church "until the consummation of the saints."[84] This conservation and perfection is not merely political, but primarily (*maxime*) the spiritual work of the "the salvation of souls" (*salutem animarum*).[85] Just as the diversity of religious orders serves not only the salvation of those congregated in them but also the salvation of others, so too the diversity of spiritual gifts in the Church serves not only the salvation of the faithful but also the salvation of the whole world. Later in the *Defensio,* Suárez invokes the same two Pauline passages mentioned earlier, Ephesians 4 and 1 Corinthians 12, to show that "various gifts are given to the Church for this end," namely, the propagation of the faith to the ends of the earth.[86] The catholicity of the Church thus both conserves the spiritual life of the faithful, and also perfects or completes the Church through its own propagation, ensuring that the Church advance throughout the world lest Christ be made poor beyond measure.

Though present in Cyril, Suárez's later interpretation of catholicity of persons to include the diversity of orders and gifts appears in some way unique for his time. Aquinas does not posit this understanding of catholicity. Nor is catholicity-as-diversity present in Catholic thinkers such as Bañez and Valencia,[87] or in Protestant thinkers such as James I in his *Premonition.* While Bellarmine makes note of a catholicity of persons in the first sense (the Church is for everyone), he nowhere interprets this dimension of catholicity in terms of a necessary diversity of spiritual graces.[88] Suárez's particular context suggests two reasons why he used an expanded meaning of catholicity in the *Defensio*. The first reason, previously mentioned, is the polemical nature of this work: Suárez is defending the spiritual diversity of orders within the Church against the political instrumentalization of such orders by James I. The emphasis on mission serves this end, as the Church is not a nation-state bound by geographic borders (see chapter 1), but must extend to every human heart.[89] The second reason arises from the fact that Suárez

[84] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.7 (*Op.* 24, 72A).

[85] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.11 (*Op.* 24, 73A).

[86] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.21 (*Op.* 24, 84B).

[87] Bañez, *Commentaria in secundam secundae*, col. 115–16; Valencia, *Analysis fidei Catholicae*, 133–35.

[88] Bellarmine, *De controversiis Christianae fidei*, vol. 2, controversy 2, bk. 4, ch. 7, 87E.

[89] Over two hundred years later, Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (New York: Library of America, 2004), 343, would arrive at a similar insight on the importance for any claim to universality of distinguishing between the spiritual and the political, writing, "When a religion seeks to found its empire solely on the desire for immortality that torments the hearts of all men equally, it can aim for universality. But when it joins forces with a government, it must adopt maxims applicable only to certain peoples. Thus when religion allies itself with a political

writes the *Defensio* at the same time as the *De religione*, which defends the vocation of the Society of Jesus. In the section of the *De religione* exposited earlier, Suárez defends religious diversity for the sake of mission to souls. As we will see in chapter 4, two of the things Suárez must defend specifically about the Society of Jesus are both its immense internal diversity as well as its missional character, which includes the fact that the Jesuits make a fourth vow of obedience to the pope regarding missions. To make his case, Suárez links the two: the diversity within the Society serves its radical missional character. Like the Church, the Society seeks to be all things to all people (1 Cor. 9:22) for the salvation of souls. It is not unlikely, then, that such reflection on his own Jesuit charism impacted his contemporaneous reflection on the catholicity of the Church.

3.3.5. Catholicity of Place: Radiating the Light of the Lord

Unlike his approach in the *De Ecclesia*, Suárez considers catholicity of place as the "main and more received etymology of the word 'catholic'"[90] and accordingly devotes two chapters to its exposition. He grounds universality of place firmly in the testimony of the Fathers and "especially Augustine," who writes that "the Church, imbued with the light of the Lord, shines its rays throughout the whole world."[91] Cyril of Jerusalem affirms that, unlike the power of a political kingdom, the spiritual power of the Catholic Church is "without borders."[92] Jerome speaks of the Church in the expansive and cosmic language of the Song of Songs, symbolized as a dove who "looks forth like the dawn, fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army with banners."[93] Tertullian speaks of the expansive reign of Christ in "innumerable provinces" throughout the world, a reign that Suárez equates with the catholicity of the Church. Suárez's fourth definition of catholicity (like the three before it) is entirely contingent on his spiritual definition of the Church exposited in chapter 1, the Church as a personal

power, it increases its power over some but gives up hope of reigning over all." See also the teaching of the Second Vatican Council, *Gaudium et Spes* 42 (DH §4342), which states that "since in virtue of her mission and nature she is bound to no particular form of human culture or to any political, economic, or social system, the Church by her very universality can be a very close bond between diverse human communities and nations."

[90] *Defensio fidei* 1.15.1 (*Op.* 24, 73B): *Praecipua magisque recepta vocis* catholicae *etymologia est, quae ab universitate locorum sumitur, qua frequenter Patres contra haereticos utuntur, praesertim Augustinus.*

[91] *Defensio fidei* 1.15.1 (*Op.* 24, 74A): Ecclesia, [*Augustinus*] *inquit*, Domini luce perfusa per totum orbem radios suos porrigit.

[92] *Defensio fidei* 1.15.2 (*Op.* 24, 74A): Regum quidem potestas certis locis et gentibus terminos habet, Ecclesiae autem Catholicae per universum orbem indefinita est potentia.

[93] *Defensio fidei* 1.15.3 (*Op.* 24, 74B).

condition and communal, spiritual way of life. His ecclesiology collapses if the Church is merely "an ecclesial nation-state."[94]

Yet, James I also "tacitly" (*tacite*) claims geographic catholicity for the Church in England, since, he claims, nearly half of the Christian world "already shares in [England's] religion."[95] Suárez parries by clarifying that although "amplitude and multitude of peoples is one of the properties of the Catholic Church, nevertheless these do not suffice to make the Church catholic."[96] Further, none of the Fathers taught that numbers alone make the Church catholic. There is the question of *what* is diffused throughout the world. Suárez answers this question on the grounds of both *catholicity* and *unity*.

First, no single dimension of catholicity can be divorced from the others; the four definitions offered (catholicity of doctrine, *regula*, persons, and place) form an integral whole, a whole that the multitude of Protestants does not possess.[97] Here we see Suárez begin to pull together the various threads of catholicity he has defended. We will return to this move.

Second, an accidental aggregate joined only in opposition to the Roman Church does not constitute a catholic unity. As Suárez writes, "it is one thing to agree in religion, another to agree in a common reason for schism and dissension from the Catholic Church." Protestants may indeed inhabit much of the world, but they do not constitute a political body because they do not agree "in one religion, that is, in one way of salvation and in one faith."[98] We have already analyzed this passage in chapter 1 (section 1.2.3) regarding Suárez's definition of the Church. Now we see the connection of this passage to the Church's catholicity, and how catholicity and unity are joined together in *religio*: in order for the Church to be Catholic, she must profess a single *religio*, or way of salvation, that is diffused throughout the world. This *religio* must profess common doctrines, follow a single *regula*, enjoy a vibrant diversity of persons and spiritual

[94] See chapter 1, section 1.2.3.

[95] *Defensio fidei* 1.15.6 (*Op.* 24, 75B): *Huic autem rationi videtur tacite voluisse occurrere Jacobus rex . . .* [qui *inquit*] *pars prope media* [*omnium ordinum christiani orbis*] *in nostram religionem jam consensit.*

[96] *Defensio fidei* 1.15.6 (*Op.* 24, 75B): *[L]icet amplitudo et multitudo populorum sit quaedam ex Ecclesiae Catholicae proprietatibus, non tamen sufficit ad catholicam constituendam.*

[97] *Defensio fidei* 1.15.6–7 (*Op.* 24, 75B-76A): [*A*]*mplitudo et multitudo populorum sit quaedam ex Ecclesiae Catholicae proprietatibus, non tamen sufficit ad catholicam constituendam; nullus enim ex Patribus hoc dixit, et quidam ex illis aperte senserunt, catholicam non ex sola universitate locorum constitui, sed ex aliis etiam proprietatibus, quas cum illa conjungunt. . . . Illa vero multitudo nec unum corpus politicum est, ut per se constat, nec mysticum aut ecclesiasticum, quia neque in eadem fide, neque in uno ecclesiastico regimine, neque in eadem regula credendi conveniunt; ergo nec tota ill multitudo populorum aut sectarum potest dici Ecclesia Catholica, cum una Ecclesia non sit.*

[98] *Defensio fidei* 1.15.7–8 (*Op.* 24, 76A): *Oportet ergo ut rex loquatur de consensione in unam religionem, id est, in unam viam salutis, et in unam fidem.*

gifts, *and* be able to retain these dimensions across time and space. This unity in faith and religion, as we already discussed,[99] does not negate legitimate diversity, and Suárez goes out of his way to make this clear: "the dissension [between Protestant sects] is not in indifferent matters but in matters most necessary; nor does this dissension concern only trifles typically discussed by jurists in subtle points chiefly serving the purpose of speculation, but it concerns things held with the hands and necessary for living rightly."[100] Suárez tolerates diverse positions regarding secondary matters of theological and juridical speculation. Indeed, he expresses an identical sentiment in his preface to the *De incarnatione*, quoted in our Introduction:

> In those things which are not established with certain faith, we both permit and read that there was a variety of opinions even among the holiest of men. And whenever the goal of everyone is the same, that is, the investigation and discovery of truth, it should not be thought that a diversity or contrariety of opinions hinders Christian charity or arises from a disunity of souls.[101]

However, on matters necessary for salvation, such as justification or the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist,[102] true unity and catholicity require agreement. The Catholics enjoy such agreement in vast numbers of people the world over, and therefore can claim geographic catholicity. The Anglicans share with Luther and Zwingli only a common opposition to Rome and, according to Suárez, little agreement on dogmas essential to faith and salvation.

The rigorous uniformity of the Church in essential matters of salvation does not inhibit diffusion but rather fosters it. This uniformity in a "way of salvation," that is, in Christ through faith and religion, is what unites the Church as a "political body." Yet she always remains a political body without geographic borders; she is a people without a home, or rather, she is a people at home only in Christ, who inhabits the hearts of the faithful precisely through such faith and *religio.*

[99] Chapter 3, section 3.3.2.

[100] *Defensio fidei* 1.15.9 (*Op.* 24, 76B): *[N]on est ergo dissensio in rebus adiaphoris, sed in maxime necessariis; neque in apicibus tantum, qui in subtilibus punctis, speculationi praecipue deservientibus, a jure consultis constitui solent, sed in rebus quae prae manibus habentur, et ad recte vivendum necessariae sunt, versatur.*

[101] *De incarnatione*, "Ad eumdem de hac posteriori editione admonitio" (*Op.* 17): *. . . in his enim, quae certa fide non sunt stata, inter viros etiam sanctissimos eam fuisse opinionum varietatem et accepimus et legimus. Cumque idem omnium scopus sit, investigatio, videlicet, inventioque veritatis, eam opinionum sive diversitatem, sive contrarietatem, aut Christianae charitati officere, aut ex animorum disjunctione provenire, putandum non est.*

[102] *Defensio fidei* 1.15.8 (*Op.* 24, 76A).

However, Christ cannot be restricted to one people or nation lest his desire that "all be saved" be left unsatisfied. Christ continues to build up his body, and thus the Christic heart of the Church, Christ's presence in each of the faithful, urges her outward lest Christ be made "poor beyond measure."[103]

This centrifugal urge is a necessary component of geographic catholicity. Suárez writes that the Church is diffused throughout the whole world "in two ways," by "right" (*jure*) and in "fact" (*facto*). The Church is universal by right

> Because she was instituted for the whole world and not for a certain nation, as was the synagogue, and also because from the moment when she was instituted, she received the right of preaching the faith of Christ throughout the whole world . . . and finally because she has the power on earth to govern the whole world in those things which pertain to the salvation of the soul.[104]

The Church was instituted with a missional purpose, and thus she possesses the "right" to satisfy this *telos*. Suárez thus expresses a similar position to that of Henri de Lubac centuries later, that the Church "is catholic because, knowing herself to be universal by right, she wants to become so in fact. Her catholicity is her vocation, which is mingled with her being."[105] In this sense, the Church was catholic and universal from her origin.

The "right" of the Church to preach the gospel does encounter certain limits.[106] Because the Church is a personal condition and not just an "ecclesial

[103] Doyle, "Francisco Suárez: On Preaching the Gospel," 914, likewise locates the Christological foundation of Suárez's teaching on the right of the Church to spread the gospel: "The basis for this [right] was that Christ had such a right over all men as his very inheritance."

[104] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.4 (*Op.* 24, 78B): *Priori modo manifestum est, Ecclesiam Christi, ex quo instituta fuit, catholicam et universalem fuisse; tum quia pro toto mundo instituta est, et non sicut synagoga pro quadam natione; tum etiam quia ex tunc accepit jus praedicandi fidem Christi per universum mundum . . . tum denique quia habet potestatem in terris ad gubernandum universum orbem in iis, quae ad salutem animae spectant.*

[105] Henri de Lubac, S.J., "The Theological Foundation of the Missions," in *Theology in History*, trans. Anne Englund Nash (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1996), 380.

[106] On these limits in Suárez see Doyle, "Francisco Suárez," 913–51. The question of the rights of nonbelievers and of nations was much reflected upon in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, particularly but not exclusively in the School of Salamanca. The Dominican Francisco de Vitoria is considered one of the foremost theorists in this regard. See *Vitoria: Political Writings*, ed. Anthony Pagden and Jeremy Lawrence (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). On the discussion of the *ius gentium* in Jesuit political theory, see Harro Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540–1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 301–13. For an example of how Christology and ecclesiology informed such debates, see Ph.-I. André-Vincent, O.P., "L'intuition fondamentale de las Casas et la doctrine de saint Thomas," *Nouvelle revue theologique* 96, no. 9 (November 1974): 944–52.

nation-state," the success of her propagation is determined by the conversion of hearts, not by the acquisition of mere numbers or land.[107] Further, Suárez adheres to the political theory set forth by Francisco de Vitoria (1485–1586), namely that, in the words of Doyle, nonbelievers and particularly those in the New World "were human beings, lords of their own lives and possessions, and it was not lawful to subjugate and despoil them without just cause—even in order to civilize and to Christianize them."[108] Thus, while Suárez considers the Church to possess the power of "defending its preachers" and of combating, even militarily, those who "through power and force impede preaching,"[109] he opposes the opinion that Christian princes could occupy a pagan kingdom for the sake of preaching the gospel, seeing such an action as an illicit, "virtual coercion to the faith."[110] He is concerned with preachers *even appearing* to occupy a kingdom, and he is very clear that the Church's propagative right does not give her an excuse to violate the "right of nations."[111] Suárez goes so far as to argue that even after the faith has been sufficiently preached to unbelievers, they may not be coerced to embrace the faith, even if they are subjects of a Christian prince,[112] as this would result in "false conversions and innumerable sacrileges."[113] Instead, the Church desires that "the first embrace and profession of the faith be simply and altogether spontaneous."[114] The ministers of the gospel are thus called to be as "sheep amongst wolves," employing persuasive and peaceful means such as "gentleness, patience, efficacy of words, and example of life" both to convert nonbelievers and to convince princes to allow evangelization in the first place.[115] Only when a pagan prince refuses entry to preachers who have exhausted such peaceful means can those same preachers be sent with a "sufficient army" strictly

[107] Suárez, *De fide* 18.1.9 (*Op.* 12, 440B), is very concerned to make sure that those to whom the gospel is preached are not "more hardened and indisposed" toward the faith on account of the aggression of preachers.

[108] Doyle, "Francisco Suárez," 880.

[109] *De fide* 18.1.4 (*Op.* 12, 438A): *. . . Ecclesiam habere jus defendendi praedicatores suos, et expugnandi eos qui, per potentiam et vim, praedicationem impediunt, seu non permittunt.* Doyle, "Francisco Suárez," 917–18, helpfully clarifies that the right to wage a defensive war was something the Pope would not exercise through clerics, but would commit to temporal sovereigns.

[110] *De fide* 18.1.9 (*Op.* 12, 440B): *est virtualis coactio ad fidem . . . quae non est licita.*

[111] *De fide* 18.1.9 (*Op.* 12, 440B).

[112] *De fide* 18.3.4 (*Op.* 12, 445B): *infideles non apostatas, tam subditos quam non subditos, ad fidem suscipiendam cogi non posse, etiamsi sufficientem illius propositionem habuerint.*

[113] *De fide* 18.3.6 (*Op.* 12, 446A–B): *modus ille coactionis erat expositus multis incommodis; nam ex eo moraliter sequerentur simulatae conversiones et innumera sacrilegia.*

[114] *De fide* 18.3.6 (*Op.* 12, 446A): *modus ille trahendi homines ad fidem non erat conveniens Ecclesiae, sed multo magis expediebat ut prima fidei susceptio et professio esset simpliciter et omnino spontanea.*

[115] *De fide* 18.1.9 (*Op.* 12, 440A): Ecce ego mitto vos sicut oves inter lupos; *quibus plane ostendit verbum fidei non esse armis introducendum, sed mansuetudine, ac patientia, et efficacia verbi, ac vitae exemplo.*

for their defense against anticipated aggression.[116] And while this compromise still exposes Christian princes and clerics to the abuse of temporal power, nevertheless Suárez cannot be accused of developing ecclesiology as an excuse for imperialism. He only reservedly permits an army to accompany preachers in very precise and non-aggressive circumstances and because he considers the salvation of nonbelievers to be at stake. The Church's universal "right" is ordered toward salvation, not colonial expansion.[117]

The Church is universal not only "by right" but also "in fact" because she began to spread throughout the world via the preaching of the apostles and now has attained "sufficient universality."[118] As discussed briefly in chapter 2 (section 2.3.5), Suárez means by "sufficient" that even if the Church has not spread to every crevice of the earth, her presence is diffuse enough to be considered "universal." On account of her gradual increase throughout history, she has attained a "universal splendor in which her dignity and majesty can be recognized and discriminated from the crowds of heretics."[119] Sufficiency does not render her work of diffusion complete, though. Suárez admits that even in his own time, the promise of universal diffusion has not been integrally fulfilled on account of the "new world" and the vast provinces discovered untouched by the gospel. The work of catholicity ever continues. Yet this pressing task does not overshadow the missional work begun in the preaching of the apostles, exponentially increased in the time of Constantine,[120] and continuing in the early modern period, all of which renders the Church factually "universal" by any prudent judgment.

The Catholic Church may be universally diffused, but does she thereby have more people than the sects of nonbelievers or heretics? Is numerical advantage an essential feature of catholicity? Suárez argues first that the Church's mark of catholicity does not distinguish it from nonbelievers but only from heretical sects, or those who "do not altogether deny Christ but worship and confess him

[116] *De fide* 18.1.10 (*Op.* 12, 440B).

[117] *De fide* 18.1.1 (*Op.* 12, 437A): *Ratio autem est clara, quia fides est omnibus necessaria ad salutem, ergo necessarium etiam fuit ut haec fides in universo mundo annuntiari posset.* In *De fide* 18.2.8 (*Op.* 12, 444A), Suárez argues that if a people desire the Christian faith yet are hindered by a nonbelieving king, they may call upon the help of a Christian prince against their own leader for the reason that by his actions, the king is impeding "the way of salvation."

[118] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.9 (*Op.* 24, 80A).

[119] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.10 (*Op.* 24, 80B).

[120] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.11 (*Op.* 24, 80B–81A). Suárez does not attribute the diffusion of the faith to Constantine. In keeping with his emphasis on the spiritual nature of the Church, Suárez writes that Constantine did not so much establish the Church's universal diffusion (this is, after all, the work of the Holy Spirit) as remove impediments to that diffusion previously set in place. Here again, and perhaps in light of his polemical context, Suárez is wary of overstating the role of political power in the Church. The work of the Holy Spirit is more evident in *Petrus et Paulus et successores* than in *Constantinus.*

in their own way."[121] Therefore, it is not necessary that "the amplitude of the Church surpass the multitude of all the infidels, but it is enough that in its own way the Church be dispersed throughout the whole world, and that in this it exceeds any particular sect of the heretics."[122] Further, catholicity does not even mean numerical advantage over the multitude of men "in false sects," that is, in all the sects "of the Gentiles, Pagans, Jews, and heretics, since concerning this comparison nothing is revealed or promised."[123] Suárez includes in this category the "sects" of the heretics, thereby suggesting that catholicity is not even about there being more Catholics than "Protestants" or other heretics. After all, "it is not unfitting that the Catholic Church be much suppressed or even lessened on account of insurgent heresies and other persecutions . . . such things were very often predicted by Christ and pertain to the narrow way which leads to life."[124]

Suárez proceeds to refer to the example of the Arian heresy in the early Church, about which time Augustine writes that the Arian heretics surpassed the number of the faithful; nevertheless, at that time "the Church was preserved in its universality through the whole world."[125] Though Suárez is skeptical that the Arian heretics actually surpassed the faithful in number,[126] he nevertheless grants the possibility and concedes that "it matters nothing if there are sometimes fewer [Catholics], especially for a brief time."[127] Suárez's concession here pushes back against his earlier assertion that the Church be not exceeded "by any particular sect of the heretics." The apparent contradiction, however, speaks to his larger point: catholicity is not simply a numbers game. New knowledge of the world coupled with historical reckoning forces Suárez to avoid a numerical argument. While it is highly unlikely (and, for Suárez, unprecedented) for a particular sect of heretics to surpass the Church in numbers, Suárez grants

[121] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.3 (*Op.* 24, 78B): *[N]am licet haeretici, quoad veritatem fidei Christiani non sint, tamen . . . non omnino Christum negant, sed eum suo modo colunt et confitentur.* Suárez is reticent to call heretics "Christians" but realizes that they still worship and confess Christ, even if not in his fullness.

[122] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.3 (*Op.* 24, 78B): *[N]on sit necessarium, ut amplitudo Ecclesiae omnium infidelium multitudinem superet, sed satis est ut suo modo sit dispersa per universum orbem, et quod in hoc excedat quamcumque haereticorum sectam.*

[123] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.12, 13 (*Op.* 24, 81B, 82A).

[124] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.15 (*Op.* 24, 82B): *[C]onstat ex dictis non esse inconveniens quod Ecclesia Catholica, propter insurgentes haereses et alias persecutiones, multum interdum deprimatur, vel etiam minuatur. Quia non solum hoc non repugnat praedictionibus vel promissionibus factis Ecclesiae Christi, verum potius illud ipsum saepius a Christo praedictum est, pertinetque ad arctam viam quae ducit ad vitam.*

[125] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.16 (*Op.* 24, 83A).

[126] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.17 (*Op.* 24, 83A). Suárez argues that though *ingemiscentem orbem terrarum se Arianum miratum esse, nihilominus ille error non fuit animo haeretico.* This distinction reinforces the primacy of the spiritual and interior for Suárez, discussed in chapter 2.

[127] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.16 (*Op.* 24, 83A).

the possibility but parries that catholicity is not a strictly quantitative category. Rather, he argues that "from when the Catholic Church began to be diffused throughout the whole world, never on account of persecutions or rising heresies did she so lose her splendor and, so to speak, possession that she ceased to be sufficiently manifest and diffused through the whole world of lands."[128] If a heresy did perhaps surpass the Church in numbers of members, it did so only for a brief and unsustainable time, while the Catholic Church has maintained a "sufficient" splendor and diffusion from her origins.

Such splendor and diffusion is one of the main differences between the position of Suárez and that of, for example, Martin Luther, who also speaks of a persecuted Church, a Church of the few, and, additionally, a "hidden" Church.[129] For Suárez, it is not that episodes of persecution, fewness, and even hiddenness are impossible in the life of the Church, but that they are not the dominant narrative. Note the difference in emphasis between Luther's *Enarrationes in Genesin* and Suárez's *Defensio.* The former writes of two churches arising from the time of Cain and Abel; one "which is the church in name but in reality is nothing but a hypocritical and bloodthirsty church" and another that is the true church "which is without influence, forsaken, and exposed to suffering and the cross"; the former church enjoys "honor before the world," while the other is "hidden; it is banned; it is regarded as heretical; it is slain."[130] Apart from Luther's language of "two churches," which Suárez never employs, Luther insists on persecution and obscurity as fundamental features of the Church.[131] Suárez clearly

[128] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.15 (*Op.* 24, 82B): *Addendum vero est, ex quo Ecclesia Catholica per universum mundum diffusa esse coepit, nunquam propter persecutiones vel haereses insurgentes ita splendorem suum et quasi possessionem amisisse, ut desierit esse sufficienter per totum orbem terrarum illustris et diffusa.*

[129] See, for example, Luther's 1542 comment at a *Promotiondisputation* for John Macchabaeus Scotus in *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar: Hermann Boehlau, 1883–1983), 39/2:167–68 [hereafter *WA*], where the former writes that the Church "always existed, even if it was not visible" (*Semper fuit Ecclesia, etiamsi non visibilis*) qualifying that the church was indeed visible to a degree. Even the papist church (*ecclesia papistarum*) preserved certain "external marks" (*notae externae*) by a "divine miracle," including the Scriptures, baptism, the sacrament of the altar, and "many good monks, such as Bernard [of Clairvaux] and Bonaventure, who were saved." For Luther's position in his earlier works, see Jared Wicks, S.J., "Holy Spirit—Church—Sanctification: Insights from Luther's Instructions on the Faith," *Pro ecclesia* (January 1, 1993): 153.

[130] Martin Luther, *Luther's Works*, American Edition, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehman (St. Louis: Concordia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1958), 1:252–53 (WA 42:187.13–37).

[131] One cannot conclude from this fact that Luther denies the visibility of the church or her ecclesiastical structure. For a good overview of Luther's position, see Bernhard Lohse, *Martin Luther's Theology: Its Historical and Systematic Development*, trans. and ed. Roy A. Harrisville (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011), 277–85.

affirms the suffering nature of the Church as she pursues the "narrow way."[132] Yet, fewness and obscurity is not a substantive feature of the Church for Suárez, who affirms rather that even amid persecution the Church shines forth as a light to the nations. Indeed, his earlier argument regarding the *nomen ipsum* of catholicity presumes as much: the Church recognized and called "catholic" by the world for centuries is the true Catholic Church.

According to Suárez, the lack of diffusion and splendor among heretical sects, that is, the lack of catholicity "in fact," stems from a lack of the other forms of catholicity. Having separated themselves from the faith that unites the Church, heretics have deviated from the certain "rule of believing, and therefore heresy can never be universally persuasive as the true and indubitable faith"[133] because its adherents lack "that unanimity which the catholic faith requires."[134] Without wading into reformation debates regarding what constitutes a *regula fidei*, I underline the importance of Suárez's invocation here of the second form of catholicity, universality in a *regula credendi*. Suárez argues that the absence of such a *regula* among the heretics—and with it an absence of the first form of catholicity, universality in the doctrinal matter of the faith, which hinges on a uniform *regula*—inhibits their missionary diffusion throughout the world. They are not united in Christ, Suárez writes, and therefore they cannot be united in "universal fraternity," since it is Christ alone who unites the moral body of the Church.[135] Further, heretics lack the "spirit of propagation" (*spiritus propagationis*), that is, they neither preach the faith to new nations nor care to bring souls back who have departed from the faith.[136] What is more, they lack the diversity of spiritual offices and gifts to accomplish this task. In other words, heretics lack catholicity of place (particularly "by right") and catholicity of persons respectively.[137]

Setting aside the question of the accuracy of Suárez's claims,[138] his polemic points to the centrality of mission to his conception of catholicity. The "manifold

[132] Suárez even speaks of a suffering and smaller Church back in his lectures *De Ecclesia* in *De fide* 9.3.9 (*Op.* 12, 258B–59A), but there still maintains that *semper tamen vera Ecclesia lucebit, et discerni poterit.*

[133] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.19 (*Op.* 24, 83B): *[Q]uia omnis haeresis introducitur per defectionem a catholica fide, et consequenter deviat a certa regula credendi, ideoque nunquam potest universaliter persuaderi tanquam vera et indubita fides.*

[134] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.20 (*Op.* 24, 84A): *illa unanimitate quam fides catholica requirit.*

[135] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.19 (*Op.* 24, 84A): *Unde merito [Cyprianus] colligit non posse in nomine Christi congregari, nec cum universa fraternitate convenire.*

[136] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.22 (*Op.* 24, 84B).

[137] *Defensio fidei* 1.16.22 (*Op.* 24, 85A): *Tandem cum extra Ecclesiam sint, potestatem praedicandi fidem Christi habere non possunt, quia haec potestas, ut dixi, data est Ecclesiae in Apostolis, et in successoribus eorum mansit, et ab eis mitti debent veri Evangelii praedicatores.*

[138] Suárez is clearly using exaggerated polemic here, but certain claims should not be written off. As Carlos M. N. Eire, *Reformations* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2016), 466,

catholicity" exposited in the *Defensio fidei* serves not only the conservation of the Church but also her perfection or completion.[139] In other words, Suárez sets forth a paradox: catholicity is simultaneously a centripetal and a centrifugal force; it moves the Church toward greater internal unity and also pushes her outward to greater diffusion. This paradoxical force can be argued from the basic logic of the idea of "universality": for a thing to be universal, it must also be one.[140] It can also be argued theologically from Suárez's notion of Christ as the guiding force of catholicity. The more the faithful are drawn to Christ, the more they desire to extend Christ to all. Suárez states as much in his *De legibus* when he discusses Christ's mandate to love one another. "This precept," Suárez writes, "concerns not only the love between Christians, but also extends to love toward nonbelievers." Suárez roots this teaching in the person of Christ, who "not only loved his already faithful disciples, but also nonbelievers, by redeeming them and desiring that they may become believers; therefore, in the same way, he commended to his disciples love for one another, which is an imitation of his love, in order that on account of that love, it may be extended to all." For Suárez, union with Christ leads to love among Christians, which then extends, by the nature of charity itself, to the whole world. And while Christians still ought to love their own "more" than men of any other religion or sect, nevertheless they ought "specially" to love those outside of the Church, desiring that they "be joined with Christ and the Church."[141] Christ is the unifying and universalizing heart of the Church.

3.4. Conclusion

G. K. Chesterton writes, "There is such a thing as a narrow universality . . . [those who] take one thin explanation and carry it very far."[142] Many theologians have

writes, "For the first century of their existence—more or less—Protestants had no overseas missions to speak of. The reason for this disparity is simple: Protestant states did not get seriously involved in overseas ventures until the seventeenth century, and those early enterprises were much smaller in scale than those of Catholic Spain and Portugal."

[139] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.7 (*Op.* 24, 72A).

[140] See section 3.3.3.

[141] *De legibus* 10.2.12 (*Op.* 6, 558A–B): *Unde etiam addo illud Christi praeceptum non fuisse de sola dilectione Christianorum inter se, sed etiam ad dilectionem erga infideles extendi. . . . [Christus] ipse autem non solum dilexit discipulos jam credentes, sed etiam infideles, redimendo illos, et desiderando ut fiant credentes; ergo eodem modo commendavit discipulis dilectionem ad invicem, quae sit ad imitationem dilectionis ipsius, ita ut propter ipsum Christum extendatur ad omnes. Et ideo, sicut Christiani inter se magis se diligunt et diligere debent quam reliqui homines cujuscumque religionis seu sectae, ita etiam specialiter amant illos qui extra Ecclesiam sunt, et illis desiderant conjunctionem cum Christo et cum Ecclesia.*

[142] G. K. Chesterton, *Orthodoxy* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1945), 33, 38.

made a similar claim of early modern understandings of catholicity: it is merely a uniformity transplanted in many places. Such is not the case for Suárez. Suárez's conception of catholicity in the *Defensio fidei* and *De religione* builds upon his Christological account of ecclesial unity that I have exposited in chapter 2. The Church's "manifold catholicity" is rooted in Jesus Christ and serves both the unity and mission of the Church. She is a "queen bedecked in variety," a plural unity and united plurality who envelops diverse peoples and nations in her maternal embrace all for the sake of preserving and spreading out of Christ-like love the faith and *religio* that make her one.

In the *Defensio*, Suárez privileges catholicity of place, which he conceives as both the power and right (*iure*) of the Church to spread to the nations, as well as the fact (*facto*) of the Church's diffusion already accomplished. Suárez qualifies catholicity "in fact" in light of historical data and early modern discovery: the Church is *sufficiently* diffused throughout the world, and the light with which she radiates Christ has never been extinguished or undiscoverable since the time of Christ, even if it has been dimmed. Yet more missional work needs to be done to spread the light of Christ to every corner of the earth. Catholicity "in fact" is intimately tied to catholicity "by right": the Church's propagative power urges her to accomplish the promise of Christ in fact, and the fact of the Church's sufficient diffusion is both a fruit of that propagative power and an impetus to further missionary work. And lest we think that Suárez's account of missional catholicity is "statistically measurable,"[143] we must again recall that geographic catholicity, and missionary work as an essential feature of catholicity, is not primarily a quantitative category, but a qualitative and even eschatological category—the mystical body enduring in Christ until the consummation of the saints. Numbers matter; one person does not make a church. Yet Suárez's ecclesiology would be incoherent if he considered catholicity and missionary work "statistically measurable" and yet considered the unity of the Church a matter of internal form and supernatural virtue. Unity and catholicity are intimately connected for Suárez. If the Church is a spiritual way of life in Christ, then the diffusion of this "way" until the end of time must have the spiritual character of Christ diffusing Christ, or, in the words of the *De legibus*, the unitive love of Christ extending to all. Such spiritual diffusion is not opposed to physical and quantitative categories any more than the formal unity of the Church is opposed to the pilgrims who constitute her and their external acts of *religio*. But the primary referent of catholicity in all its forms is spiritual life in Christ, who draws all people to himself and simultaneously sends them out to the nations, so that all peoples might be gathered unto him in eschatological consummation.

[143] Avery Cardinal Dulles, S.J., *Models of the Church* (New York: Image, 2014), 34.

4

The Society of Jesus as the Ideal Expression of Unity and Catholicity

4.1. Introduction

"Jesus is, as it were, the bond and center in which the members of this religion are united. . . . They had been joined together by the supreme bond of charity, and this charity alone had united them from such diverse nations by a perpetual bond and by the utmost consent of souls, and in this congregation they especially desired to pass on this spirit."[1] Suárez wrote this passage toward the end of his life in the *De religione*. The "religion" and "congregation" of which he speaks could very well apply to the *congregatio fidelium*, the Church universally scattered throughout the world while bound into a *societas* by the unifying Spirit of Christ. But here Suárez is speaking of a different *religio* and *societas*, the *Societas Iesu*, or the Jesuit order.

Suárez is well aware that since its founding, both Catholic and Protestant opponents of the Jesuits had criticized the young order for usurping a name belonging to the whole Church (*Societas Iesu*).[2] For example, the Dominican Melchior Cano chastises those who "unworthily confer that title ['the Society of his son Jesus Christ' (1 Cor. 1:9)] to themselves," perhaps placing them in the company of heretics.[3] Such critiques did nothing, however, to deter Suárez

[1] *De religione* 10.1.1.5, 10 (*Op.* 16.1, 556A, 558B): *Jesus est quasi vinculum, et centrum in quo hujus religionis socii copulantur. . . . [S]ummo charitatis vinculo conjuncti erant inter se; haec enim sola, ex tam diversis nationibus, summo animorum consensu, et perpetuo nexu eos copulaverat, et hunc spiritum in sua congregatione relinquere maxime cupiebant.*

[2] John O'Malley, S.J., *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1993), 34; Thomas Joseph Campbell, *The Jesuits, 1534–1921: A History of the Society of Jesus from Its Foundation to the Present Time* (New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1921), 7.

[3] Melchior Cano, O.P., *De locis theologicis libri duodecim* (Louvain: Servatius Sassenus, 1564), bk. 4, 222: *Fidelis Deus, per quem vocati estis in societate filii eius Iesu Christi* [1 Cor. 1:9]. *Quae sine dubio societas cum Christi ecclesia sit, qui titulum sibi illum arrogant, hi videant, an haereticorum more penes se ecclesiam existere mentiantur.* Suárez cites this passage in *De religione* 10.1.1.9 (*Op.* 16.1, 558A). O'Malley, *The First Jesuits*, 292, refers to Cano's opposition to the Society as "rabid."

Unity and Catholicity in Christ. Eric J. DeMeuse, Oxford University Press. © Oxford University Press 2022.
DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780197638637.003.0005

from describing the Jesuit order in ecclesiological language in the *De religione*. In fact, just four pages before citing Cano's criticism, Suárez himself alludes to 1 Corinthians 1:9 to express his gratitude to the Jesuits and to God "who called me into the Society of his Son," referring in this case, of course, to the Jesuit *societas*.[4]

Suárez's use of ecclesiological language to describe the Jesuits is not a coincidence. Indeed, there are precedents for such linguistic confluence in St. Ignatius of Loyola and other Jesuit thinkers. Suárez, I suggest, builds on this tradition in order to argue for the legitimacy and necessity of the Jesuit order in the Church. In other words, part of Suárez's argumentative strategy in the *De religione* is to present the Society of Jesus in the language of the ecclesial society. To be clear, his argument is not that all the faithful should imitate the Society, nor that the Society is in competition with the Church. Rather, Suárez considers the Society a specific instantiation of the ecclesial way of life; and not just *any* instantiation, but arguably the most excellent one.[5] Thus, his ecclesiology exposited in the preceding chapters can shed light on his defense of the Jesuit order.

In this chapter, I will argue that it is in the charism of the Society of Jesus that Suárez sees the dynamic between Christic unity and missional catholicity most perfectly lived out in the praxis of the Church. I will begin by noting precedents within the Jesuit tradition for speaking of the Society of Jesus in ecclesiological terms. I will then exposit places where Suárez explicitly discusses the relationship between the Jesuit order and the Church. This exposition will particularly focus on Suárez's defense of the name *Societas Iesu* in the *De religione* (section 4.2). I will then examine how Suárez sees the Society as most perfectly embodying the unity and catholicity of the Church, and as thereby fulfilling the twofold (conservative and propagative) impulse described in previous chapters (sections 4.4–4.5). This twofold impulse reflects the language Suárez uses to describe the conservative and propagative mission of the universal Church, but also stretches the ecclesiological point by showing the degree to which these two impulses mutually determine one another in the life of the Church. Suárez's defense of the Jesuits thus sheds light not only on the Society of Jesus, but also on the society of the faithful to which all Christians belong.

[4] *De religione* 10.preface (*Op.* 16.1, 554A): *Non quia veritas ipsa, quae luce clarior est, aut religio, quam Apostolica Sedes toties probavit, et divina gratia suis operibus illustriorem reddidit, nostra defensione aut illustratione indigeat, sed ut signum aliquod grati animi, et Deo, qui me vocavit in Societatem Filii sui, et ipsi Societati, cui totum, quod sum, vel habeo, debitum recognosco exhiberem.*

[5] Insofar as Suárez is arguing that the Society of Jesus is a most perfect expression of the highest state of life (objectively speaking) within the Church.

4.2. The Relationship of the *Societas Iesu* to the *Societas fidelium*

4.2.1. The Church and the *Compañía* in Early Jesuit Thought

Though Ignatius of Loyola never penned a treatise *de Ecclesia*, he nevertheless speaks of the Church frequently throughout his writings,[6] with one of the *loci classici* occurring in a 1555 letter to Emperor Claude of Abyssinia.[7] I will compare the ecclesiology of this document with other letters in order to show parallels between how Ignatius describes the Church and how he describes the Society of Jesus.

Ignatius begins the 1555 letter by delineating the authority with which Christ invested St. Peter and his successors, "bestowing upon him a plenitude of power" necessary to "maintain" (*mantener*) the flock of the faithful in the Christian life and religion, and to "lead them" (*conduciéndolos*) to the kingdom of heaven. It is in union (*vnión*) with this "complete and sovereign dominion" that Ignatius sends his missionaries, "true shepherds of souls," to the emperor.[8] Indeed, Ignatius thinks that those who separate themselves from union with the head, that is, Christ and his Vicar,[9] are members "torn from the body [of the Church]" who do not "receive life (*influxo de vida*) from the body or movement or feeling (*mouimiento y sentido*) from its head."[10] Ignatius describes the effect of members' union with the head in the same language employed by Aquinas and Suárez in chapter 2: influx, movement, and feeling.[11] Union with the head gives life to the members of the body "throughout the whole world."[12] For Ignatius, union is not opposed to diffusion but a necessary prerequisite.

[6] We have already noted some places where Ignatius provides ecclesiological insights. See, for example, the *SpEx*, 412, no. 365: *entre Xpo nuestro Señor, esposo, y la Yglesia, su esposa, es el mismo espíritu que nos gouierna y rige para la salud de nuestras ánimas*, quoted in chapter 2, section 2.2.1. In this present section we look closely at the letters of Ignatius.

[7] George E. Ganss, S.J., ed., *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus,* trans. George E. Ganss, S.J. (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1970), 123, fn. 10, describes this letter as "remarkably indicative of [Ignatius'] ecclesiology."

[8] Letter to Claude, Emperor of Abyssinia, 23 February 1555, in *Letters*, 368–69; *EppIgn.*, 8.461–62. Where available, I will quote from the two available translations of select letters of Ignatius, namely, that of Young and that of Martin E. Palmer, S.J., et al., *Letters and Instructions*. I will include citations of the original texts from the *Monumenta*, quoting from the original only when necessary.

[9] Ignatius, *Letters*, 369–70; *EppIgn.,* 8.463.

[10] Ignatius, *Letters*, 369; *EppIgn.,* 8.462.

[11] See chapter 2, section 2.2.2.

[12] Ignatius, *Letters*, 369; *EppIgn.,* 8.462.

Ignatius proceeds to invoke a bevy of biblical images to describe the unity of the Church, many of which we encountered in previous chapters: the spouse of Christ, the dove from the Song of Songs, the one fold of sheep, the ark of Noah, the tabernacle of Moses, and the temple of Solomon.[13] Yet his clear preference is for St. Paul's image of the body of Christ, as he later recounts the "singular blessing" of being "united to the mystical body of the Catholic Church, which lives and is ruled by the Holy Spirit, who according to the Evangelist teaches her all truth."[14] In a 1553 letter to the whole Society, Ignatius similarly writes that the Jesuits "must love the entire body of the Church in Jesus Christ her head" and apply remedies to "that part of the body which is seriously and dangerously ill."[15]

Ignatius employs similar language of body, head, and members when speaking of the makeup of the Society of Jesus. George E. Ganss, S.J., writes that in the Jesuit *Constitutions*, "Ignatius' fundamental image of the Society is that of a body . . . with the general as its head . . . and with members."[16] This preferred imagery also appears frequently in Ignatius' letters.[17] However, such body-head-members language does not of itself suggest an ecclesiological analogue since, as discussed in chapter 1, such language was a common way of describing not only the Church but also any political body in the sixteenth century. Indeed, in a 1547 letter to the Jesuits of Gandia, Ignatius himself writes that "wherever a number of persons lived together, there was to be among them a head (*cabeça*) who had authority to direct and govern the other members (*miembros*)," hereby comparing the Jesuit structure not only to that of the Church but also to the structure "in kingdoms and municipalities (*los reynos como en las ciudades*)."[18] In his famous letter to the Jesuits in Portugal, Ignatius emphasizes the importance of obedience to superiors in the Society and compares it to "well-ordered states (*policías seglares bien ordenadas*)" as well as to "the hierarchy of the Church."[19]

[13] Ignatius, *Letters*, 369; *EppIgn.*, 8.462. See chapter 1, section 1.2.1.

[14] Ignatius, *Letters*, 370–71; *EppIgn.*, 8.464.

[15] Letter to the Whole Society, 23 July and 7 August 1553, in *Letters and Instructions*, 434; *EppIgn.*, 5.221. This is also an image preferred by St. Francis Xavier, S.J., "An Explanation of the Creed," in *The Letters and Instructions of Francis Xavier*, trans. M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J. (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1992), 159.

[16] Ganss, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, 122, fn. 10.

[17] See, for example, Letter to Andrés de Oviedo, 27 March 1548, in *Letters and Instructions*, 244; *EppIgn.*, 2.64; Letter to the Jesuits of Gandia, 29 July 1547, in *Letters and Instructions*, 199; *EppIgn.*, 12.336. Further examples will be examined.

[18] Letter to the Jesuits of Gandia, 29 July 1547, in *Letters and Instructions*, 196; *EppIgn.*, 12.332–33. See also Letter to Andrés de Oviedo, 27 March 1548, in *Letters and Instructions*, 239; *EppIgn.*, 2.56.

[19] Letter to the Jesuits of Portugal, 26 March 1553, in *Letters and Instructions*, 420; *EppIgn*, 4.680.

Nevertheless, a number of Ignatius' writings suggests that he envisions the Society of Jesus as more akin to the Church than to a political commonwealth. For one, Ignatius is always careful to root the headship of the Jesuit general and superiors in the headship of Christ. In his *Spiritual Diary*, Ignatius explicitly calls Christ "the head of the Company of Jesus,"[20] and in the letter to the Jesuits in Portugal he reminds them "to practice recognizing Christ our Lord in any superior."[21] Indeed, it is the headship of Christ over the Society of Jesus that enables it to be scattered throughout the world. To the Jesuits in Gandia, Ignatius writes that obedience to Christ in each superior is "especially [essential] in [the body of the Society] . . . [whose members] are scattered in places far distant from the superior's place of residence."[22] As Ignatius writes to Niccolò Lancilotti, in Jesus Christ the members of the Society are "made into a single body wherever in the world we may be," a use of *cuerpo* that alludes to St. Paul's language of the body of Christ and cannot be applied to a geographically bounded political body.[23] Ignatius further invokes St. Paul's ecclesiological language of head and members when speaking of the unity of the Jesuits in a letter to Andrés de Oviedo.[24] And in his 1555 letter to the emperor of Abyssinia, Ignatius mentions that he sends, along with the Jesuit chosen to become patriarch, twelve Jesuit priests "out of devotion to the number which represented Christ our Lord and his twelve apostles."[25]

The founder of the Jesuits clearly saw the unity and mission of the *Compañía* through an ecclesiological lens. The Society, like the Church, is bound together by Christ, which enables it to be scattered throughout the world. Ignatius' use of ecclesiological language to describe the Jesuit charism was not lost on his opponents, who, as noted in the Introduction, accused the young Jesuit order of pompously usurping the name of the Church for itself. This accusation did

[20] *Cons*, 1.104: *Jesú . . . seyendo él la cabeça de la Compañía.*

[21] Letter to the Jesuits of Portugal, 26 March 1553, in *Letters and Instructions*, 413; *EppIgn*, 4.672.

[22] Letter to the Jesuits of Grandia, 29 July 1547, in *Letters and Instructions*, 199; *EppIgn*, 12.336: *No poca autoridad, aun sin la dicha conservación, redunda en todo el cuerpo de la Compañía, á la qual es utilissimo que los studiantes, y otros que la siguen, sean muy ejercitados en la obediencia. . . . Y la razón desta utilidad es, porque, con ser en toda congregatión muy necessaria esta virtud de la obedientia, specialissimamente lo es en esta, por ser personas de letras los que hay en ella, y ser enviados por el papa y perlados, y sparzidos en lugares remotissimos de donde reside el superior.*

[23] Letter to Niccolò Lancilotti, 22 November 1547, in *Letters and Instructions*, 224; *EppIgn*, 1.648. The Latin here is emphatically ecclesiological: *X. Jesu, in quo omnes unum efficimur corpus, ubicumque terarum simus constituti*, and the editor even adds a footnote to Romans 12:5: *ita multi unum corpus sumus in Christo, singuli autem alter alterius membra.*

[24] Letter to Andrés de Oviedo, 27 March 1548, in *Letters and Instructions*, 244; *EppIgn*, 2.62.

[25] Letter to Claude, Emperor of Abyssinia, 23 February 1555, in Letters, 368; *EppIgn*, 8.461. Ignatius notes here that the purpose of the missionaries is to "preserve and advance (*conservar y llevar*) the religion (*la relligión*) and glory of Christ our God and Lord."

nothing to dissuade Ignatius' spiritual sons from defending the Society in the ecclesiological language of its founder. In Jerónimo Nadal's (1507–1580) exhortation delivered at the Collegio Romano in 1557, the year after Ignatius' death, he notes that "we conclude that the foundation of our Society is Jesus Christ crucified," and that just as Christ redeems humanity with the cross and daily suffers afflictions "in his mystical body, which is the Church," so too the members of the Society of Jesus imitate him in suffering many persecutions for the salvation of souls. Nadal then adds that on account of this Christic foundation, "our Society is called the Society of Jesus."[26] In his response to Tomas de Pedroche's criticism of the name "Society of Jesus," Nadal is very clear that he is not speaking of parallel societies (the Jesuits and the Church), but of a particular *religio* and society (the Jesuits) living out its special grace and way of life within the universal society of the Church.[27]

In her earliest days, the members of the Society of Jesus thus spoke of themselves in ecclesiological terms. They belonged to a body united in Jesus Christ, and this unity enabled them to spread the gospel throughout the world. As the Society grew, its members continued to employ ecclesiological language to describe it. For example, in 1593, the Bohemian Jesuit Jakob Spanmüller (1542–1626) describes the Society in St. Paul's language of the body of Christ: "Being many we are one body; not all the members have the same function."[28] Yet Ignatius and his progeny never presented themselves as a "sect" or a society separate *from* the Church as their critics surmised.[29] Rather, in the words of Nadal, they envisioned the Society of Jesus as a *religio* within the *religio* of the Church. Decades later, Suárez would gather these various strands of thought in order to develop his own defense of the Society of Jesus in the *De religione.*

[26] *FN*, 2.10: *Ex his colligimus Societatis nostrae fundamentum esse Iesum Christum crucifixum, ut sicut ipse cum cruce genus humanum redemit et quotidie maximas patitur afflictiones et cruces in Corpore suo mystico, quod est Ecclesia; sic et is qui Societatis nostrae est, non aliud sibi proponat quam ut, per plurimas persecutiones Christum sequens, animarum salutem una cum ipso Christo procuret, quandoquidem illae, Christi sanguine redemptae, tam misere pereunt. Ex hoc principio, Christo Iesu, secuta sunt duo alia: primum quidem quod Societas nostra sit nuncupata Societas Iesu.*

[27] *FN*, 1.320: *Est una quidem societas Christi in universum, sub qua particularis quaedam societas Iesu instituta est . . . [the Society is a religio], modo enim gratiam accipiat a Deo specialem ad certum vitae institutum.*

[28] Jakob Spanmüller, "Reflections on Literary Studies," in *Jesuit Pedagogy: 1540–1616*, ed. Cristiano Casalini and Claude Pavur, S.J. (Boston: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2016), 266; *Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu*, vol. 141, *Monumenta Paedagogica* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1992) 7.95: *Unum corpus multi sumus, nec omnia membra eundem actum habent.* This passage reflects 1 Corinthians 12:12, 15–20; and Romans 12:4.

[29] See, for example, the Lutheran Martin Chemnitz, *Examen concilii Tridentini* (Berlin: Schlawitz, 1861), 2: . . . *[S]ectam Iesuitarum potissimum in perniciem Ecclesiarum Germaniae creatam esse.*

4.2.2. A Society Taking the Name of Her Mother: Suárez's Defense of the Name

Whether battling old ghosts or new foes, Suárez begins his defense of the Jesuits by taking up and advancing the argument of his forebears against those who would criticize the name of his order, *Societas Iesu*.[30] In this section, we will examine in particular his arguments against those who insist that the Society "usurps the name of the universal Church for itself."[31] An analysis of Suárez's response will reveal how he envisions the charism of the Society in relationship to the Church, something we will explore further in section 4.2.3.

Employing a line of argument also used by Juan Alfonso de Polanco (1517–1576), Suárez first insists that the Jesuits' taking the name of Jesus for themselves is a mark not of pride but humility, for "although it ought to be our task to retain the name of Ignatius in perpetual memory and affection, and his virtues ought to be imitated, nevertheless Ignatius himself desired the name of Jesus to be fixed in our hearts, and therefore he desired the Society to be marked not by his own name, but by that of Jesus."[32] Yet this argument does not absolve the Society of all arrogance, for some insist further that the Society takes upon itself the name of the universal Church. Suárez counters by defining arrogance according to St. Thomas (*ST* 2.2, q. 112, a. 1, ad 2), which is either to attribute some good or virtue to oneself that one does not actually possess, or to claim such a good to be from oneself rather than from God. Yet on both accounts, Ignatius and the Society are inculpable.[33] Suárez argues first that the Society does not attribute this name to itself inaccurately: the Jesuits truly (*vere*) are the Society of Jesus

[30] Criticism of the name *Societas Iesu* arose from Catholic thinkers like Cano as well as Protestant thinkers such as Martin Chemnitz, *Theologiae Iesuitarum praecipua capita* (Leipzig: 1563), *De sacra scriptura*: *Cum igitur nova haec factio Iesuwitarum* [*sic*] *nomen Iesu (vere ne an in vanam postea videbimus) sibi assumat, ut prae reliquis omnibus ordinibus ipsa appellatione populo Christiano se insinuet.* Suárez, *De religione* 10.1.1.4, 9 (*Op.* 16.1, 555B, 558A), is aware of both of these opponents.

[31] *De religione* 10.1.1.12 (*Op.* 16.1, 559A).

[32] *De religione* 10.1.1.11 (*Op.* 16.1, 559A): *Quanquam ergo nostri muneris esse debeat, nomen Ignatii perpetua memoria et affectu retinere, ejusque virtutes imitari, ipse tamen Jesu nomen voluit esse infixum in cordibus nostris, et ideo non suo, sed illo voluit Societatem insigniri.* Further down in this section, Suárez will explicitly speak of Ignatius acting thus *humiliter.* See also Juan Alfonso de Polanco, *De vita P. Ignatii,* ch. 9, no. 112, in *FN*, 2.596: [Ignatius and his companions] *coeperunt orare et cogitare quod nomen ipsis magis conveniret. Et cum considerassent quod inter se nullum caput haberent praeter Iesum Christum, cui soli servire optabant, visum illis est ut Eius nomen sibi imponerent, quem pro capite habebant, et Societas Iesu ipsorum congregatio vocaretur. . . .* [*H*]*umilis Pater, qui in huius Societatis institutione omne Christo et nihil sibi tribuebat, non a se sed a Iesuchristo illam sumere nomen optavit.*

[33] *De religione* 10.1.1.12 (*Op.* 16.1, 559A).

> now because in him it is united with a perfect union, by which the members are joined to the head, and by reason of him are joined among themselves, now also because the Society fights under Jesus as under a supreme commander, and finally because it discharges its duties for Jesus in mission to men, in order that they may be reconciled to God, and they cooperate with him, insofar as possible, for the salvation of souls.[34]

Suárez proceeds to defend the Society against the second meaning of arrogance, arguing that she attributes all of the fruit (*lucri*) of her labors to Jesus Christ, from whom she receives her "origin and progress."[35]

We will return to the Christological and unitive aspects of this passage in section 4.3. For our purposes here, it should be noted that Suárez does not respond to his detractors by creating distance between the universal Church and the Society of Jesus, but rather by affirming that the Society bears its name truly, regardless of any proximity to the name of the Church. In fact, Suárez immediately employs ecclesiological language to defend the name of the Society: she enjoys union in Christ as members to a head; she is a militant society led by Christ; she is commissioned to reconcile humanity to God and for the salvation of souls; she attributes to Christ her origin and progress. Suárez thus defends the Society of Jesus not by denying the similarities between it and the Church, but by embracing them.

Yet Suárez does not think he has alleviated all accusations of arrogance, and thus proceeds to address the same objection from a slightly different angle. Some, Suárez asserts, think the Society of Jesus pridefully usurps for itself a name that is common to all the faithful. Is not the whole Church the "society of Jesus"? Suárez deftly displays his humanistic and scholastic training, employing counterarguments from the disciplines of both dialectics and theology. The common doctrine among dialecticians, Suárez writes, is that a generic expression can be attributed to an inferior species, thereby denoting not an excellence but only what is held in common. For example, a "colt" can legitimately be called a "horse," yet such a designation detracts nothing from the broader signification

[34] *De religione* 10.1.1.12 (*Op.* 16.1, 559A-B): *Nam imprimis hoc nomine profitetur, quod vere est Societas Jesu, tum quia in illo unitur perfecta unione, qua membra capiti copulantur, et inter se ratione illius; tum etiam quia sub illo, tanquam sub primario duce, militat; tum denique quia pro illo legatione ad homines fungitur, ut Deo reconcilientur, illique ad salutem animarum, quantum potest, cooperatur.*

[35] *De religione* 10.1.1.12 (*Op.* 16.1, 559B): *Tum denique quia, quidquid lucri in negotiatione sua haec Societas intendit, totum ad Jesum pertinet; non enim quae sua sunt, sed quae Jesu Christi quaerere debet ac conatur. . . . Propterea enim non alterius nominis, sed Jesu appellata est, ut ab illo intelligat se habere originem et profectum.*

of the word "horse," which includes fillies, geldings, stallions, etc. The same can be said of how the Society of Jesus employs its name, which "of itself does not signify any excellence other than that which is common to the whole Church and to all of its members, and therefore it has been able to be attributed to some part of it, not as more excellent, but as the least (*minimae*), and as if to a part that has nothing of its own in which it may glory."[36] Here Suárez implicitly nods to a common refrain among the founders of the Society, particularly Ignatius and Nadal, that she is the "least Society" or "least congregation."[37] Following the rule of the dialecticians, he considers the fact that the Jesuits bear the name "Society of Jesus" a mark of her littleness and humility in dependence on the broader, ecclesial reality common to the general *societas Jesu.*

Likewise the teaching of the theologians, Suárez quickly adds, permits common names to "rightly be appropriated to something both when a dearth (*penuria*) of names forces such an appropriation and when a sufficient reason (*ratio*) is found for it."[38] For example, the common words that fit all the persons of the Trinity are applied to one or another of the three persons, like holy and spirit to the Third Person, power to the Father, and wisdom to the Son. Furthermore, the word "religious" can refer both to all those who worship the true God as well as to those who particularly devote their lives to divine cult in religious life. The same argument can thus be applied to the appropriation of the name *societas Jesu* by the Jesuits. First, the Jesuits are "specially" joined by Christ and "specially" cooperate in his work of the salvation of human beings. Second, the Jesuits imitate the life of Christ in a "proper and particular way," and for this the Society educates

> its own chiefly to live among themselves in the highest union of charity, in the manner of disciples of Christ, and to be conformed to Christ, especially in obedience to the Father and in desire for the salvation of souls; all of which effects the name bears with it, according to 1 John 1, "What we have seen and heard we announce to you that you may have

[36] *De religione* 10.1.1.13 (*Op.* 16.1, 559B): *[N]omen autem Societas Iesu, licet excellentiam magnam prae se ferat, tamen ex se non aliam significat praeter illam, quae toti Ecclesiae, et omnibus membris ejus communis est, et ideo attribui potuit alicui parti ejus, non tanquam excellentiori, sed tanquam minimae, et quasi nihil proprium habenti unde glorietur.*

[37] *Constitutions* §1 begins with the expression "this least congregation." See also Nadal, FN, 1.321: *. . . . Patri Ignatio est illud familiare, ut quoties Societatem nominat, in re praesertim gravi, nunquam omittat minimam dicere Societatem.*

[38] *De religione* 10.1.1.13 (*Op.* 16.1, 559B): *Deinde addo, etiam esse vulgarem Theologorum doctrinam, nomina communia, quamvis excellentia, recte appropriari alicui, quando et penuria nominum cogit, et sufficiens ratio ad talem appropriationem invenitur.*

> society with us and our society may be with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ.[39]

Third, the *religio* of the Jesuits promises singular obedience to the Vicar of Christ in opposition to the heretics who "with a special hatred persecute the Apostolic See and, to the same degree, the Catholic Church."[40] Suárez adds, "Therefore, this religion does not assume the name 'Society' in order that it may claim the name of the universal Church for itself, but rather that it may profess itself her daughter, and profess obedience to her in a particular way. But who would reprehend a daughter because, out of special affection for her mother, she rejoices to be signed by her name?"[41]

As with his first argument, Suárez does nothing here to lessen the perceived connection between the two societies, the Church and the Jesuits. Instead, he argues that the Jesuits rightly bear the name *Societas Jesu* not only because of their special union with the redemptive mission of Christ, but also because of their special devotion to the Church. Indeed, he confirms the accusation of his opponents, namely that the Society of Jesus *does* bear the name of the universal Church, and "rejoices" at the appropriation of such a name for his religious order. He even applies an ecclesiological passage from 1 John to the Jesuit society, as he did earlier with St. Paul's teaching in 1 Corinthians. Yet Suárez, like Nadal before him, is very clear that the Society of Jesus is not a society parallel to the Church. Rather, she is like a daughter under the mantle of her mother, bearing her mother's image and proclaiming her goodness to the ends of the earth. Precisely *how* Suárez envisions this relationship we will now explore.

4.2.3. The Most Perfect Way of Life: The Society within the Society

Already in chapter 1 we discussed how the use of *religio* in the sense of one of the varieties of religious states is grounded in and born out of the notion of the

[39] *De religione* 10.1.1.13 (*Op.* 16.1, 560A): *Secundo, quia Christi vitam proprio et particulari modo imitatur . . . quia in hoc praecipue suos instituit, ut summa unione charitatis inter se vivant, more discipulorum Christi, et ut Christo conformentur, praecipue in obedientia ad Patrem, et in affectu ad animarum salutem; quos omnes effectus nomen illud prae se fert, juxta illud 1 Joan. 1: Quod vidimus et audivimus, annuntiamus vobis, ut et vos societatem habeatis nobiscum, et societas nostra sit cum Patre, et cum Filio ejus Jesu Christo.*

[40] *De religione* 10.1.1.13 (*Op.* 16.1, 560A).

[41] *De religione* 10.1.1.13 (*Op.* 16.1, 560A): *Non ergo nomen* Societatis *haec religio assumpsit, ut universalem Ecclesiam sibi arrogaret, sed potius ut se illius filiam, et peculiari modo illi obedientem profiteretur. Quis autem filiam reprehendat, quod ex peculiari affectu ad matrem nomine ejus insigniri gaudeat?* Suárez adds a brief final argument in conclusion, namely, that the Society bears her name out of respect for Christ, just as other congregations bear the name of the Trinity or other such mysteries with similar reverence.

Church as *religio*; the ecclesial way of life is the common, essential foundation of every other ecclesial state.[42] The "state of the Christian life" is shared by the laity and the religious alike, though the latter add something to this state, namely, they live the life of the evangelical counsels through vows.[43] The ecclesial "way of life" thus applies to all Christians in common, while the religious take on this way of life in a very particular manner. This rationale is in part of Suárez's defense of the name of the Society of Jesus: the Jesuits *do* profess to live the ecclesial way of life and thus rightly bear their name in common with the Church. But he also maintains that they were instituted to profess this life *in a particular way*, indeed, as I will show, in a most perfect way. This "perfection" detracts nothing from Suárez's claim that the Jesuits are a "least Society" in the Church. He argues for their littleness insofar as the Jesuits are a part (*nomen . . . attribui potuit alicui parti ejus*) in relation to the whole, whereas his argument that the Jesuits profess a most perfect way of life in the Church is in relation to other parts (religious orders and other states of life), as will be shown. In this section, we will develop the relationship of this "particular way" of life to both the common, ecclesial way of life (the whole, as it were) as well as to other particular forms of ecclesial life (the other parts).

Suárez explicitly discusses the relationship between the "state of perfection" and the ecclesial "state of the common life" in tractate seven of the *De religione.* As mentioned, Suárez considers the state of perfection to "add something better and more perfect" to the common, ecclesial way of life.[44] He delineates the relationship between the two states as the relationship between the thing which contains (*includens*) and the thing contained (*inclusum*), the former being the state of perfection, the latter the state of the Christian life.[45] Since the Christian life is the foundation of all salvation, it must necessarily be contained in every other state of life ordered to salvation. The state of perfection thus exists as "through addition" to the state of the Christian life, as "a perfection is compared to the thing which is perfectible, or as a determination is compared to the thing able to be determined."[46] The state of perfection adds "a special advantage"

[42] Chapter 1, sections 1.3.2 and 1.3.4.

[43] Chapter 1, section 1.3.4, in which is cited *De religione* 7.1.2.9 (*Op.* 15, 11A): *Unde status perfectionis ab hoc distinguitur [ab statu christianae vitae] tanquam illi aliquid melius et perfectius addens, ideoque ab illo tanquam includens ab incluso distinguitur. Explicatur, quia in vita christiana est fundamentum totius salutis, et ad illud est necessaria . . . ergo status perfectionis habet se, quasi per additionem ad statum vitae christianae.*

[44] *De religione* 7.1.2.9 (*Op.* 15, 11A): *Unde status perfectionis ab hoc distinguitur tanquam illi aliquid melius et perfectius addens.*

[45] *De religione* 7.1.2.9 (*Op.* 15, 11A).

[46] *De religione* 7.1.2.9 (*Op.* 15, 11A): *Quod si in statu perfectionis id praecise consideretur, quod supra statum vitae christianae addit, sic comparabitur ad illam tanquam perfectio ad perfectibile, vel tanquam determinatio ad determinabile.* We should *not* presume from this that the state of the Christian life is a *mere* "determinability" with no determination of its own. Again, earlier in the *De religione* 7.1.2.7 (*Op.*

(*peculiarem utilitatem*) to ecclesial life and therefore is considered more advantageous and a greater help for the observance of that life.[47] On the basis of Suárez's analysis, we could conclude that the state of perfection is an exemplary (but not exhaustive) representation of the Church's way of life. For this reason, it is little wonder that Suárez occasionally compares the Church to a religious order.[48]

The state of perfection has various gradations and includes a number of other states,[49] but Suárez places the vowed religious life as second only to the episcopate.[50] He provides a number of reasons for this ordering, but he most often mentions that the episcopacy is a state of perfection "to be exercised" (*exercendae*), whereas the religious life is a state of perfection "to be acquired" (*acquirendae*).[51] In other words, a bishop is expected, on account of the grace of his office, to exercise acts of an evangelical perfection already possessed, whereas a member of a religious order enters such a state in order to acquire perfection.[52] We will return to the relationship between the episcopacy and the religious state.

Among the various religious states that profess vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, Suárez follows Aquinas in distinguishing three broad categories: those ordered to the active life (corporeal and spiritual works of mercy), the contemplative life (the perfection of contemplation, and mortification for the sake of that end), and the mixed life (contemplative life "mixed" with active, spiritual ministries for others).[53] Though he does not, like Suárez, use the term "mixed life," Aquinas argues that a religious life that actively teaches and preaches (*ordinantur ad docendum et praedicandum*) yet "from the plenitude of contemplation" (*ex plenitudine contemplationis*) is superior to either contemplative or

15, 10B), Suárez writes that the *status vitae christianae non est nisi ratio aliqua vivendi stabilis et firma, ad salutem gratiae in hac vita, et gloriae in futura consequendam, ordinata et instituta.* We analyzed this passage in chapter 1, section 1.3.4. The state of the Chtistian life is determined in having an express purpose for grace and glory, while also possessing the ability to take on additional, more specific determinations, just as a woman has the determinability to become a mother or a religious sister, though the absence of one or the other or both does not render her womanhood altogether without determination.

[47] *De religione* 7.1.2.9 (*Op.* 15, 11A). My analysis presumes what has already been argued in chapter 1, namely, that the "state of the Christian life" is synonymous with "life in the Church."

[48] Chapter 1, section 1.2.3. Other thinkers make a similar move though not to the same extent as Suárez. For example, Domingo Bañez, O.P., *Commentaria in secundam secundae angelici doctoris D. Thomae* (Venice: Bernardus Iunta, 1586), col. 110, compares catechumens to novices in a religious order.

[49] See *De religione* 7.1.13–21 (*Op.* 15, 61–112).

[50] *De religione* 7.1.18.2 (*Op.* 15, 93A).

[51] *De religione* 7.1.13.2 (*Op.* 15, 93A).

[52] This understanding of the religious life as a *status perfectionis acquirendae* is crucial to both Aquinas' (*ST* II-II, q. 189, a. 10, *corpus*) and Suárez's account of vocational discernment.

[53] *De religione* 9.1.5.5–14 (*Op.* 16.1, 454A–56B).

active life alone, and most closely approximates episcopal perfection. He reasons that "just as it is better to illuminate than only to shine, so too it is better to hand on to others those things contemplated than only to contemplate."[54] Though he provides strong reasons for his argument, we also should not forget that Aquinas belonged to the "order of preachers," and thus there is a certain opportunism in putting his own degree of religious life as the highest. We will find a similar opportunism in Suárez's account of the mixed life.

Suárez argues that the mixed life is the highest degree of religious life "since this mixed life includes the whole perfection of the contemplative life, and in no way diminishes it, but rather adds something, and therefore is absolutely more perfect."[55] This "something added," namely, spiritual and corporal acts for one's neighbor, does not impede the perfection of contemplation in the least. Rather, since, morally speaking, the soul cannot love God *in Himself* (that is, by contemplation) actually, continuously, at all times, and without intermission, then "if the actual contemplation of God is to be interrupted sometimes, there is no better or more fruitful way in which this can happen than by actions of charity toward one's neighbor, and most of all in spiritual ministries."[56] But Suárez goes even further. These "interruptions" are in no way an interruption in the love of God, for "these ministries which occur for the salvation of neighbors are external acts of love not only for the neighbor, but also for God; therefore, they are of the sort to be more meritorious than purely internal contemplation."[57] The spiritual works of illuminating and converting men are thus "external works of friendship toward God."[58] Such actions are "more meritorious" because "love which does not confine itself to the interior affect, but proceeds in exterior and, to that degree, perfect effects, is more efficacious."[59] This argument comes as no surprise

[54] *ST* II-II, q. 188, a. 6, *corpus*: *Sicut enim maius est illuminare quam lucere solum, ita maius est contemplata aliis tradere quam solum contemplari.*

[55] *De religione* 9.1.6.19 (*Op.* 16.1, 464B): *quia haec vita mista includit totam perfectionem vitae contemplativae, et in nullo eam diminuit, sed potius addit aliquid; ergo est absolute perfectior.* Suárez, *De religione* 9.1.5.9 (*Op.* 16.1, 455A), considers Christ Himself to be the model of the mixed life: *[N]on repugnat dari religionem, quae simul contemplationi et actioni principaliter intendi . . . quia Christus Dominus hoc vitae genus professus est, ideo enim et pernoctabat in oratione Dei, et praedicabat, ac discurrebat, benefaciendo et sanando.*

[56] *De religione* 9.1.6.20 (*Op.* 16.1, 465A): *Si autem actualis contemplatio Dei aliquando interrumpenda est, nullo meliori ac fructuoso modo interpolari potest, quam actionibus charitatis erga proximum, et maxime in spiritualibus ministeriis.*

[57] *De religione* 9.1.6.23 (*Op.* 16.1, 466B): *[H]aec ipsa ministeria, quae in salutem proximorum fiunt, sunt actus externi non tantum dilectionis proximi, sed etiam Dei; ergo ex suo genere sunt magis meritorii, quam pure interna contemplatio.*

[58] *De religione* 9.1.6.23 (*Op.* 16.1, 466B): *. . . opera externa amicitiae in Deum.*

[59] *De religione* 9.1.6.23 (*Op.* 16.1, 466B): *[A]mor autem, qui non sistit tantum in interiori affectu, sed prodit in exteriores effectus adeo perfectos, est magis efficax.*

given Suárez's ecclesiological account of internal and external acts discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.4.2)—spirit always tends toward flesh. Suárez even argues here, as he did earlier, for the mutual determination of such acts; that is, not only do external acts flow from internal affect, but such external acts often require a "new interior act." Indeed, the love that moves from contemplation to external acts of love for one's neighbor prepares the sort of will that charity toward God elicits.[60] External, spiritual action toward one's neighbor thus "amplifies and extends" interior charity.[61]

Having established vowed religious life as the second highest form of ecclesial life (next to the episcopacy), and further having established the mixed life as the highest form of religious life, Suárez considers which order professes the mixed life most perfectly. In keeping with his praise of catholicity-as-diversity discussed in chapter 3, Suárez is careful not to disparage any religious order, instead devoting an entire book to discussing and commending the origin, history, and distinct charism of every major religious order in the Church.[62] Yet he unsurprisingly gives Jesuits the pride of place, considering the young order to exemplify the mixed life *par excellence*.[63] Indeed, so perfectly does the Society profess this life that "the principle actions in which the active life of the Society is engaged are so joined with the contemplative life that from them, as if from a body and soul, a single thing is produced."[64] The single purpose of the Society is, as it were, a composite unity.[65] It consists of a "body," that is, actions for the salvation of others, and a "soul," that is, contemplation for the perfection of the individual Jesuit. Just as in his hylomorphic ecclesiology, Suárez sees no separation between the body and soul of the Society, but an integral and noncompetitive relationship. Personal holiness and aiding the holiness of others inform each other: "true charity is not contrary to charity."[66] Suárez describes these two ends

[60] *De religione* 9.1.6.24 (*Op.* 16.1, 466B–67A): *[Q]uando exterior actus requirit novum interiorem actum, multum addere [interiori] . . . nam amor, qui sistit in pura contemplatione, non parit voluntatem efficiendi talia opera, quibus glorificetur in hominibus Deus; amor autem, qui progreditur ad hanc actionem, parit hanc voluntatem, quam ipsamet charitas Dei elicit.*

[61] *De religione* 9.1.6.27 (*Op.* 16.1, 468A): *. . . etiam intelligere licet, cum mens contemplantis descendit ad compassionem proximi, et ad orandum pro illo, non cadere ab optima via exercendi vel perficiendi charitatem, quia in eo non recedit a perfecta charitate Dei, sed illam quodammodo amplificat et extendit; ita ergo qui ad actionem ex eodem motivo descendit, nihil per se impeditur a perfectione charitatis, sed potius in ea promovetur.*

[62] *De religione* 9.2.1–10 (*Op.* 16.1, 498A–552B).

[63] *De religione* 10.1.6 (*Op.* 16.1, 587A–93B).

[64] *De religione* 10.1.6.10 (*Op.* 16.1, 592B): *[P]rincipales actiones, in quibus vita activa Societatis versatur, ita sunt conjunctae cum vita contemplativa, ut veluti ex corpore et animo unum quid ex illis efficiatur.*

[65] To use his description of the Church in chapter 1, section 1.2.1.

[66] *De religione* 10.1.2.10 (*Op.* 16.1, 565B): *[V]era charitas non est charitati contraria.*

of the Society as "mutually determining each other, and thus from them is forged one fitting and most perfect end of this religion."[67]

While other mixed and mendicant orders may pursue a similar twofold end, they nevertheless seek the salvation of others "secondarily" and "as if from abundance,"[68] but in the Society of Jesus, "the whole weight of religion is ordered to this end [of the salvation of others]."[69] And this end, Suárez writes, "appears to be a principal end of the state of religion as instituted by Christ the Lord."[70] This takes nothing away from Suárez's claim that the Society professes the mixed life and *not* the active life. Rather, Suárez considers the Society "*per se* and principally" to intend *both* the contemplative and the active life.[71] He scrupulously lists all the ways in which the Society lives out the contemplative life,[72] but adds that "in virtue of its institute, the sons of this religion ought to be contemplatives, and not in any way, but in such a way that they make men contemplatives."[73] By thus embracing this twofold purpose, the Society most nearly approximates the office of the bishop, the highest state of perfection, since "[the Society] is ordered of its own power not only to perfection to be acquired, but also perfection to be exercised and communicated." Thus, Suárez concludes, the Society of Jesus is in a higher state of perfection than other religious orders.[74]

Of course, other religious orders may object to Suárez's rationale and, certainly, his conclusion. But this is beside the present point. Relevant here is the relationship between the Jesuit *religio* and the *religio* of the Church. I have argued that Suárez considers the state of perfection to be an exemplary expression of

[67] *De religione* 10.1.2.5 (*Op.* 16.1, 562B): *. . . mutuo sese determinent, et ita ex eis confletur unus adaequatus et perfectissimus finis talis religionis.* Suárez thus preserves what François Courel argues was Ignatius' original intent, namely, that in the Society there is a single end. See "La fin unique de la Compagnie de Jésus," *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu* 35 (1966): 186–211.

[68] The *ex abundanti* hearkens to Aquinas' description of action flowing *ex plenitudine contemplationis.*

[69] *De religione* 10.1.2.14 (*Op.* 16.1, 568A): *[A]liae religiones, etiam mendicantes, ita respiciunt hunc finem, ut totum religionis pondus non illum principaliter respiciat, sed valde secundario, et quasi ex abundanti, ut sic dicam. . . . [V]ero in Societate totum religionis pondus ad hunc finem ordinatur.*

[70] *De religione* 10.1.2.6 (*Op.* 16.1, 563A): *Quin potius, si recte verba Christi in Evangelio expendamus, hic videtur esse praecipuus finis status religiosi a Christo Domino instituti, vel significati.*

[71] *De religione* 10.1.6.2 (*Op.* 16.1, 587B).

[72] *De religione* 10.1.6.4 (*Op.* 16.1, 588A–B).

[73] *De religione* 10.1.6.5 (*Op.* 16.1, 589A): *Ergo signum manifestum est, alumnos hujus religionis ex vi sui instituti contemplativos esse debere, et non quomodocumque, sed ita ut viros contemplativos possint efficere.*

[74] *De religione* 10.1.7.5 (*Op.* 16.1, 595B): *[I]n statu autem perfectionis supremum locum tenent Episcopi; ergo religio, quae ad illum statum propinquius accesserit, erit ex suo genere in altiori statu perfectionis, quam reliquae; sed Societas propinquissime videtur accedere statum Episcopalem . . . nam ex vi sui finis ordinatur [status episcopatus et Societatis Iesu] non modo ad perfectionem acquirendam, sed etiam exercendam et communicandam.*

the Church's way of life. Within the state of perfection, Suárez considers the vowed religious life to be the second highest form of life next to the episcopacy; he considers the mixed life to be the highest form of vowed religious life; and he considers the Society of Jesus to be the highest form of mixed life, even approaching the perfection of the episcopacy. To put it briefly, Suárez considers the Society of Jesus to be a near-ideal representation of the ecclesial society. As a result, it is feasible to argue that *how* the Society of Jesus lives out its twofold purpose is reflective of *how* the Church ought to live out her mission, and vice versa. Indeed, Suárez even uses similar language to describe the mission of the two societies: the Jesuits simultaneously seek the salvation of their members and the salvation of others, and the Church's "conservation and perfection," as discussed in chapter 3 (section 3.3.4), speaks to the perfection of her members and the salvation of the world.[75] In the next section, then, I will examine more deeply this relationship between the two societies by focusing particularly on how Suárez understands the unity and universality of the Jesuits, and how this understanding compares with and further enfleshes his ecclesiology.

4.3. The Christic Unity and Missional Universality of the Society of Jesus

4.3.1. Christ the Center

In chapter 2, we demonstrated that Suárez conceives of the unity of the Church as fundamentally Christological. The Church is united first by the form of faith and then by charity, the "proper and perfect life of the Church," and it is through such faith and charity that Christ inhabits the hearts of the faithful and molds them into His body. While Suárez does note the importance of Jesuits maintaining a uniformity of faith, a point we will discuss in the following section (section 4.3.2), speaking of a bond of "faith" among the Jesuits would in one sense be superfluous, as faith is the obvious *sine qua non* of membership in the Jesuits as well as the Church. To be a Jesuit one must be a member of the Church, and, according to Suárez, to be a member of the Church means that one has received the gift of faith. This is why Suárez homes in on charity as the unitive bond of the Jesuits, using very similar language to describe this bond in both the Church and the Society. As he says of the Society: "Jesus is, as it were,

[75] Suárez, *De religione* 10.8.7.17 (*Op.* 16.2, 954A), will even speak of the "conservation and perfection" of the charity which binds the Society together: . . . *ejus [charitatis amplitudo et aequalitas et] perfectio et conservatio.* This language is already present in the Jesuit *Constitutions*, which speak of the need for the Society to be "conserved and increased" (*conservari . . . augeri*) through divine help. See *Constitutions* §812; *Cons*, 3.270.

the bond and center in which the members of this religion unite. . . . They had been joined together by the supreme bond of charity, and this charity alone had united them from such diverse nations by a perpetual bond and by the utmost consent of souls."[76] Suárez even speaks of the name of Jesus being "fixed in our hearts,"[77] since in Christ the Society of Jesus "is united with a perfect union, by which the members are joined to the head and, by reason of him, joined among themselves."[78] Though in his ecclesiology Suárez highlights the form of faith as the *sine qua non* of ecclesial membership, even there he maintains the priority of charity for sustaining the ecclesial way of life, and highlights such charity here when discussing the Jesuit way of life. Suárez's understanding of the unity of the Jesuits thus reflects his understanding of ecclesial unity.

One of the ecclesiological issues raised in chapter 2 was the question of *visible* unity. Of the many critics of the Society of Jesus, none accused the order of being an "invisible" society, and thus Suárez does not *explicitly* address the question of the visible unity of the Society. Nevertheless, Suárez does argue that every state of perfection should "be external and visible" since it pertains not only to God "who alone regards the heart," but also to the Church, which is visible.[79] Now, if we are correct that his accounts of the two societies are mutually informative, then we can reasonably presume that Suárez would delineate both a material and formal visibility to the Society of Jesus, as he did for the Church. Material visibility would reside in her members and governing body. Formal visibility would reside in the actions and ministries of her members. We will now examine how Suárez applies both of these types of visible unity to the Jesuits.

As we have seen, Suárez, following Ignatius, often refers to the Jesuits as "members" of the Society.[80] Again following Ignatius, he further considers this membership to allow for "grades of persons" (*gradus personarum*), depending on one's status and progression within the Society.[81] The Society also possesses a visible structure of monarchical governance mixed with aristocratic elements, a structure that imitates (*imitatur*) and bears a likeness (*similitudo*) to the

[76] *De religione* 10.1.1.5, 10 (*Op.* 16.1, 556A, 558B): *Jesus est quasi vinculum, et centrum in quo hujus religionis socii copulantur. . . . [S]ummo charitatis vinculo conjuncti erant inter se; haec enim sola, ex tam diversis nationibus, summo animorum consensu, et perpetuo nexu eos copulaverat.*

[77] *De religione* 10.1.1.11 (*Op.* 16.1, 559A): *. . . Jesu nomen [Ignatius] voluit esse infixum in cordibus nostris.*

[78] *De religione* 10.1.1.12 (*Op.* 16.1, 559A–B): *Nam imprimis hoc nomine profitetur, quod vere est Societas Jesu, tum quia in illo unitur perfecta unione, qua membra capiti copulantur, et inter se ratione illius.*

[79] *De religione* 7.1.5.6 (*Op.* 15, 28B).

[80] See, for example, *Constitutions* §671.

[81] *De religione* 10.7.4.1 (*Op.* 16.2, 923B). See also *De religione* 10.6.4.35 (*Op.* 16.2, 865A). See, for example, *Constitutions* §205; *Cons*, 3.63, where Ignatius refers to *cuiuscumque gradus et dignitatis in Societate sint.*

governing model of the Church.[82] This structure is necessary for the Society of Jesus, as it would be for any religious order that was "one political body diffused throughout the whole (*universum*) world simultaneously with the catholic Church and has members very distant [from each other] in a diversity of places."[83] Suárez will even go so far as to apply the teachings of Bellarmine on the papacy and Nazianzus on the bishop to the role of the superior in the Society, though of course always *per proportionem*.[84] This "proportion" is crucial in light of Suárez's understanding of the relationship between the two societies previously articulated, and he is careful even here to make a similar distinction, namely, that this "likeness" is not an equality, but an "imitation and participation" in the governance of the Church.[85] Suárez makes such a clarification before articulating certain differences, such as that the superior of the Society is in some sense subject to the Society itself, whereas the pope is not, properly speaking, subject to the society of the Church.

The further nuances of membership and governance in the Society of Jesus need not be explored here. What is important is that Suárez continues to recognize a "likeness" between the two societies in his description of what we might call the material visibility of the Society of Jesus. And this material visibility is never separated from the interior "bond" of the Society, namely, the presence of Jesus Christ. Even her governing structure, according to Suárez, flows from the Christological center of the Society. Suárez is aware of Ignatius of Loyola's famous letter on obedience wherein the saint admonishes his fellow Jesuits to obey their superiors, "recognizing Christ our Lord in any superior, reverencing and obeying his Divine Majesty in him with all devotion."[86] Following his spiritual father, Suárez thus encourages the Jesuit to "consider Christ in his superior," the one "who holds the place of God and is the head of this body,"[87] and to offer himself in obedience, which he calls a "burnt offering" of the "whole person" to

[82] *De religione* 10.10.1.11, 14 (*Op.* 16.2, 1061B, 1062A).

[83] *De religione* 10.10.1.2 (*Op.* 16.2, 1058A): *[M]oraliter necessaria sunt in quacumque religione, quae cum sit unum politicum corpus, per universum orbem simul cum Ecclesia catholica diffunditur, habetque membra secundum locorum diversitatem valde distantia.* As for the political body of the Church, Suárez also refers to the Society's union as one of "common consent." See *De religione* 10.8.8.3 (*Op.* 16.2, 955B).

[84] *De religione* 10.10.1.11 and 10.6.2.9 (*Op.* 16.2, 1061A and 848A).

[85] *De religione* 10.10.1.11, 14 (*Op.* 16.2, 1061B, 1062A).

[86] Letter to the Members of the Society in Portugal, *Letters,* 413; *EppIgn.*, 4.670. Suárez references this "Letter on Obedience" in *De religione* 10.4.14.1 (*Op.* 16.2, 768B). See also *Constitutions* §606.

[87] *De religione* 10.4.15.15 (*Op.* 16.2, 784A): *. . . in suo Superiore Christum considerat . . .*; *De religione* 10.4.14.17 (*Op.* 16.2, 774B): *. . . voluntas Superioris, qui vicem Dei gerit, et caput est hujus corporis.*

God in the "fire of charity."[88] For Suárez, the superior is a *viva regula*, a "living rule" to whom all members must adhere in their whole person.[89]

As with his account of ecclesial unity and membership, Suárez roots the Jesuit *modus vivendi* in the person of Christ, who manifests himself in the "head and members" of the Society, and to whom all pledge unfailing obedience. And while this understanding of the Society is clearly *influenced* by his ecclesiology—he is explicitly presenting the unity of the Society in ecclesiological language, likely to bolster his defense of the Society against opponents—it also provides *insight* into that ecclesiology, particularly regarding ecclesiastical obedience. If the perfect response of the Jesuit to his superior is an offering of the whole self in obediential love, then should this not also be, to some degree, the response of the faithful to Christ in the bishop, the pope, indeed in the whole Church, who, as discussed in chapter 1 (section 1.2.3), is a "living rule" who bears the authority of Christ and in whom the Holy Spirit immediately (*immediate*) guides, governs, and teaches?[90] Indeed, the failure to offer oneself in obedience is precisely how Suárez describes the imperfect union of schismatics and mortal sinners; they retain the faith, yet lack the obedience that brings them into perfect membership with Christ and the Church.[91] Much more could be said of Suárez's account of the degrees of obedience in the Society, or how he deals with difficulties in obedience and abuses of authority. Relevant here is that this account of religious obedience can be applied *per proportionem* to ecclesiastical obedience and enable us to reflect more deeply on how all the faithful united in Christ are called to offer themselves, and what happens when they fail to offer such obedience.

Of course, while the visible members and hierarchy pertain to what we call the "material" visibility of the Church and Society, Suárez locates the faithful's obediential response to Christ more properly under "formal" visibility. Indeed, as discussed in chapter 2 (section 2.4.2), when speaking exclusively of the Church, Suárez lists "signs of true religion and ecclesiastical obedience" under the external manifestations of the interior form of faith.[92] In that chapter, we highlighted three accounts of *formal* ecclesial visibility provided by Suárez: hylomorphic,

[88] *De religione* 10.4.15.14 (*Op.* 16.2, 783A): *Quod satis declaravit B. P. Ignatius in citata epistola, cum dixit obedientiam esse holocaustum, quo totus homo sine ullo prorsus imminutione, conditori suo ac Domino per manus ministrorum in charitatis igne immolatur.*

[89] *De religione* 10.1.9.6 (*Op.* 16.1, 605B).

[90] *Defensio fidei* 1.11.7 (*Op.* 24, 56A); 1.3.8–9 (*Op.* 24, 16A).

[91] *De fide* 9.1.14 (*Op.* 12, 249A–B).

[92] *De fide* 9.8.6 (*Op.* 12, 274B): *quamvis vera fides interior sit, tamen per externa signa videri aliquo modo potest; quamvis ergo non videatur ipsa forma qua membra Ecclesiae interius uniuntur inter seipsa, videtur saltem suis signis, atque hoc est satis ut videamus corpus Ecclesiae, et membra quae illud componunt; et de singulis quidem membris, quando adsunt talia signa verae religionis et obedientiae ecclesiasticae, prudenter judicare possumus vere esse membra Ecclesiae, quamvis non certitudine prorsus infallibili.*

social, and incarnational/sacramental. We can find all three of these present in Suárez's description of the Society of Jesus.

Already in section 4.2.3, we witnessed a hylomorphic account of the external actions of the Society of Jesus. Suárez stated that "the principle actions in which the active life of the Society is engaged are so joined with the contemplative life that from them both, as if from a body and soul, a single thing is produced."[93] The relationship between internal contemplation and external action for the salvation of others is mutually determinative, according to Suárez. The external action of "illuminating and teaching" always must flow from contemplation in which the teacher is "taught" by God.[94] At the same time, external, spiritual actions "amplify and extend" internal charity. This symbiotic relationship between the internal and external reflects the direct proportionality between union with Christ and external manifestation in Suárez's ecclesiology (chapter 2, section 2.4.2). The Society, as professing the most perfect form of the mixed life, lives out this hylomorphic unity of purpose most perfectly in the Church.

The social visibility of the Society is argued with more difficulty than the hylomorphic because her members are spread abroad on mission (discussed in section 4.3.2) and the Jesuits are not required to pray the office in choir.[95] Nevertheless, since the Society of Jesus imitates the society of the Church, geographic proximity is not necessary for even this social, visible unity, as we demonstrated in chapter 2 with regard to prayer (section 2.4.3). Further, when speaking of the state of perfection in general, Suárez makes clear that it is not an angelic state, "but a human state, and therefore it is a work that is constituted through actions which can be made known to men and to the visible Church."[96] Thus the religious state must exhibit external actions not only because of the hylomorphic relationship between the internal and external, but also because vowed religious are social creatures whose actions must be knowable "for the common advancement of the faithful."[97]

[93] *De religione* 10.1.6.10 (*Op.* 16.1, 592B): [*P*]*rincipales actiones, in quibus vita activa Societatis versatur, ita sunt conjunctae cum vita contemplativa, ut veluti ex corpore et animo unum quid ex illis efficiatur.*

[94] *De religione* 10.6.2.9 (*Op.* 16.2, 848A): [*I*]*n illuminando et docendo alios* [*participatio muneris Episcopalis*] *consistit, et ideo ad illum assumi non debet, nisi qui didicerit per contemplationem, quae postea docet per actionem.*

[95] *De religione* 10.1.8 (*Op.* 16.1, 597A).

[96] *De religione* 7.1.5.6 (*Op.* 15, 28B): *[H]ic vivendi modus sit externus et visibilis, et consequenter ut per externam actionem vel quasi professionem assumatur . . . quia hic status non tantum attenditur in ordine ad Deum, qui solus intuetur cor, sed etiam in ordine ad Ecclesiam, quae visibilis est. . . . Unde, ut sic dicam, non est status angelicus, sed humanus; ergo opus est ut per actiones constituatur quae hominibus et visibili Ecclesiae innotescere possint.*

[97] *De religione* 7.1.5.6 (*Op.* 15, 28B): *. . . ad communem profectum fidelium.*

Suárez highlights the social visibility of the Society when discussing the fraternal charity that the Jesuits show toward each other. Following the teaching of St. Ignatius, Suárez considers fraternal charity to be a unitive bond of the Society that manifests itself in external works.[98] In keeping with his understanding of the twofold purpose of the Society, Suárez sees no conflict between union in Christ and union in fraternal charity, since such charity is the effect of Christ alone. Suárez proceeds to list and explain the various actions by which members of the Society show such charity toward one another, everything from care for the sick to hospitality to coming together for community meals—and Suárez is clear that no one is allowed to skip community dinner, no matter how old or advanced or learned he may be.[99] Suárez even considers familiar conversation to be a visible, social manifestation of charity, since such conversation fosters friendship, which, according to Aristotle, "increases with communication, but is dissolved by maintaining silence."[100] All of the social actions of the members of the Society, from the sublime to the mundane, can manifest the charity of Christ that binds them together.

In addition to hylomorphic and social conceptions of the visible unity of the Society, Suárez also appeals to a sacramental and incarnational logic. We have already seen how Suárez conceives of the missional purpose of the society as an imitation of Christ's ministry,[101] and earlier in the *De religione*, Suárez compares the external professions of religious to the visible actions of the sacraments, particularly those that establish the faithful in a state of life such as marriage, ordination, and baptism.[102] Further, when speaking of fraternal charity, Suárez encourages his confrères to see each other as visible manifestations of Christ who dwells within them. In the Jesuit *Constitutions*, St. Ignatius admonishes each Jesuit to "show exteriorly" respect to his brothers and thus "to recognize [God our Lord] in his neighbor as in His image."[103] He later insists that it is this "love of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ" that binds the Society together and

[98] *De religione* 10.8.7.3 (*Op.* 16.2, 948B): *[N]ec immerito B. P. N. Ignatius in hac unione et vinculo fraternae charitatis praecipuum hujus religionis fundamentum posuit.*

[99] *De religione* 10.8.8.3 (*Op.* 16.2, 955B). Suárez notes that the Jesuits make exceptions only for illness and for the Superior General, whose ministry might keep him from the common table.

[100] *De religione* 10.8.8.11 (*Op.* 16.2, 958A): *[A]micitia, Aristotele teste, communicatione crescit, taciturnitate dissolvitur.*

[101] *De religione* 10.1.2.6 (*Op.* 16.1, 563A)

[102] *De religione* 7.1.5.6 (*Op.* 15, 28B).

[103] *Constitutions* §250, §671. The reference to "our Lord Jesus Christ" in *Constitutions*, §671 is present in the Latin text of the *Constitutions*, but absent in the Spanish text, and therefore absent in Ganss's translation based upon the Spanish text. Compare *Cons.* 3.223 with *Cons.* 2.619. Suárez is drawing on the Latin text and thus includes this reference to Jesus Christ in his quotation of the relevant passage.

must grow among its members. Suárez commenting on both passages, writes that "nothing so brings about the love of true charity toward someone as to see in him the singular adornments of virtues and the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and to contemplate him depicted in the best hues of grace as the image of God."[104] As indicated, Suárez considers Christ to be present with a particular density in the superior, whom the Jesuit is called to reverence as Christ. Suárez even compares the obedience owed to a superior to the adoration that the faithful render to an icon of Christ, "since Christ is adored in the image."[105] Suárez considers such contemplation of Christ visible in others to be the foundation of the external acts of charity that members of the Society exhibit toward all.

In this section we have highlighted both the internal and external factors that unite the members of the Society of Jesus. These factors both reflect Suárez's ecclesiology and shed light on his ecclesiology, indicating just how far external acts of charity toward members can extend. Nevertheless, the Society, like the Church, was established not only for the perfection of her members but also for the salvation of the world. Suárez already hints at the necessity of this outward impulse when he argues for familiar conversation even with those outside the Society, since the preaching of the gospel must be "fostered and digested, as it were, by the warmth of familiar conversation" to which the members of the Society must "descend" for the sake of the salvation of others.[106] In short, the Christic unity of the Society does not result in isolation and removal from the world, but throws the members of the Society out into the world. Like Christ, they must descend to all those whom they are called to serve.[107] The unity of the Society is simultaneously a centripetal and centrifugal impulse to spread the charity of Christ throughout the Society and to the ends of the earth.[108] In this sense, the Society, like the Church, is called to be universal.

[104] *De religione* 10.8.8.1 (*Op.* 16.2, 955A): *. . . quia nihil ita conciliat erga aliquem verae charitatis amorem, quam singularia virtutum ornamenta et Spiritus Sancti dona in eo conspicere, eumque ut Dei imaginem, optimis gratiae coloribus depictum, contemplari.*

[105] *De religione* 10.4.15.14 (*Op.* 16.2, 783B): *Potest hoc declarari exemplo latriae, quae eadem in Christum et imaginem ejus fertur; quia Christus in imagine adoratur, et ob eamdem Christi excellentiam, imago Christi coadoratur.*

[106] *De religione* 10.9.8.5 (*Op.* 16.2, 1046B): *[Q]uia generales sermones, seu conciones, licet pro communitate necessariae sint, nisi calore familiaris conversationis sancte foveantur, ut quasi digerantur, facile oblivioni traduntur; praeterquam quod necessarium saepe est illa generalitate descendere ad modum et mensuram, ac particulares circumstantias unicuique accommodatas, quod maxime fieri debet in colloquiis privatis.*

[107] This "descent" is not a reference to the Son descending from heaven, but of Christ descending into the midst of the people, conversing, eating, and drinking with them. Suárez specifically highlights the example of Christ to defend the Society's use of familiar conversation in *De religione* 10.9.8.2 (*Op.* 16.2, 1045B).

[108] Paul V. Murphy, "'God's Porters': The Jesuit Vocation according to Francisco Suárez," *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu* 70, no. 139 (2001): 12, notes well this "centrifugal nature" in the Society as expressed by Suárez.

4.3.2. The Four Forms of Universality in the Society of Jesus

In chapter 3 we outlined four meanings of catholicity (synonymous with "universality") in Suárez's mature ecclesiology: universality of doctrine, both in matter and in *regula*, universality of persons, and universality of place. All of these understandings of universality serve the mission of the Church. Universality of doctrine ensures that what is spread abroad is not dissipated. Universality of persons enables the Church to accommodate herself in every measure to those whom she serves and evangelizes. And universality of place pertains to both the fact and the right of the Church's propagative nature. As he does of the Church, Suárez speaks of the Society of Jesus imitating the Apostles and thus striving, as much as possible, to be "universal."[109] In this section, we will explore how the universality of the Society of Jesus imitates that of the Church.

We begin with universality in the matter of doctrine. Suárez insists that the unique nature and mission of the Jesuits requires knowledge of and adherence to all doctrines concerning faith and morals: "In a state of religion whose end is not only to contemplate, but also to hand on the things contemplated, common knowledge is not necessary, but perfect knowledge of all things which pertain to faith and morals."[110] Suárez makes this argument in the context of defending the extensive theological education demanded of the Jesuits. The members of the Society must diligently pursue their studies both for their own sanctification and in order to hand on the faith to others.[111] Thus the members will progress, in the words of Chrysostom quoted by Suárez, "not only in rectitude and holiness of life, but in sincerity and fullness (*ubertate*) of doctrine."[112] Since the Society professes the perfection of the mixed life, it is necessary that her members learn and adhere to all doctrines of faith and morals in order to teach them to others.

In addition to knowing and adhering to all such doctrines, Suárez further insists that the members of the Society possess a uniformity of mind and heart. This uniformity reflects the Church's second form of doctrinal universality, namely, universality in a *ratio credendi*. In the Church, Christ and the Holy Spirit speak through the *viva regula* of the whole Church and the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and presence of this *regula* in the Church, adhered to by the faithful, maintains the necessary uniformity of faith and *religio* by which the Church is

[109] *De religione* 10.5.2.6 (*Op.* 16.2, 809A).

[110] *De religione* 10.5.1.6 (*Op.* 16.2, 803A): *in statu religioso, cujus finis est non solum contemplari, sed etiam contemplata aliis tradere, necessaria est non vulgaris scientia, sed perfecta rerum omnium, quae ad fidem et mores pertinent.*

[111] Suárez discusses how study does not inhibit contemplation at *De religione* 10.5.1.13 (*Op.* 16.2, 805B).

[112] *De religione* 10.5.1.15 (*Op.* 16.2, 806B).

universal.[113] In the Society of Jesus, Suárez insists that the unity of the Society in doctrines and actions can be preserved only by a "universal" obedience toward Jesus Christ in the Jesuit superior as the *viva regula*,[114] which we have discussed, and by a conformity of mind and heart to the Jesuit way of life. In the *Constitutions*, St. Ignatius insists that the Jesuits "should all think alike and speak alike"[115] and argues for "uniformity, both interior uniformity of doctrine, judgments, and wills, as far as this is possible, and exterior uniformity in respect to clothing, ceremonies of the Mass, and other such matters, to the extent that the different qualities of persons, places, and the like, permit."[116] Following his spiritual father, Suárez argues in the ecclesiological language of Acts 4:32 that the members of the Society ought to be of "one mind and one spirit, possessing all things in common," and that they ought to observe "uniformity and conformity even in all external things."[117] Suárez is clear, however, that such uniformity does not eliminate legitimate diversity. Just as the *regula credendi* of the Church both required a uniformity of faith and *religio* while permitting a diversity of liturgical expressions, so too the *regula* of the Society requires uniformity in matters of faith and sure knowledge while permitting "diversity of opinion," as this is only part of the human condition.[118] Diverse opinions and judgments, however, ought always to be presented with "gentleness and moderation of words and modesty of spirit," and never with "rash contradiction and pertinacious defense of one's own opinion."[119] The dynamic between unity and diversity articulated here reflects Suárez's conviction, articulated in our introduction, of the importance of a diversity of theological opinions in the Church supposing a

[113] See *De fide theologica* 5.5 (*Op.* 12, 152A–54B); *Defensio fidei* 1.23.6 (*Op.* 24, 113A); chapter 1, section 1.2.3.

[114] See, for example, *De religione* 10.4.14.18 (*Op.* 16.2, 775A): *Hoc satis patet ex dictis, quia hoc modo [pura et formalis intentio obedientiae] exercetur obedientia ex influxu altiorum virtutum, tum etiam quia sic est obedientia universalior ex vi sui motivi, et ita melius disponit hominem ad obediendum in omnibus. . . .* For Ignatius' teaching on how the members of the Society ought to excel in obedience, see Letter to the Members of the Society in Portugal, *Letters*, 413; *EppIgn.*, 4.670. This obedience to the superior is even necessary in order for the Jesuit to live properly the Jesuit way of life and "not to miss any point of perfection" in his adherence to the *Constitutions* (*Constitutions* §547).

[115] *Constitutions* §273. See also §47, §274, §358. Many thanks to Fr. Aaron Pidel, S.J., for his assistance in locating these passages.

[116] *Constitutions* §671. See also §821.

[117] *De religione* 10.8.7.3 (*Op.* 16.2, 948B).

[118] *De religione* 10.8.7.9 (*Op.* 16.2, 951B): *Quia vero humana conditio non fert, ut in his rebus, quae sub fidem aut scientiam non cadunt, omnino diversa ingenia consentiant, ideo per hanc regulam non praecipiamur nullam inter nos habere opinionum diversitatem, sed ut doctrinae differentes non admittantur.*

[119] *De religione* 10.8.7.11 (*Op.* 16.2, 952A): *Diversitas enim judiciorum . . . adeo humana est, ut si lenitate et moderatione verborum, animique modestia proponatur, neminem prudentem offendat; at contentio, temeraria contradictio, et pertinax propriae sententiae defensio, plurimum laedit.*

uniformity of faith.[120] Yet when speaking of the Society, he gives further caution about how this diversity ought to be lived out, namely, with modesty and humility, and provides a *regula* to govern such diversity, namely, unity and fraternal charity.

The "diversity" of the Society extends not only to the individual opinions of her members, but also to the variety of persons and gifts that constitute the Society. Here we encounter the third form of universality, that "of persons." Suárez considers it a mark of pride that "this body [of the Society] consists in more, and a greater variety of, members and is more heterogeneous, as I might say, than other religious orders, since the end to which it is ordered requires more duties, which in turn requires more organs [to fulfill those duties]."[121] Indeed, the Society includes a "diversity of grades and of persons," both ordained and lay, which "can rightly be enumerated among the means instituted for salvation."[122] Elsewhere he describe these various grades of persons within the Society as "heterogeneous members of one organic body," language identical to his description of the Church.[123] As in his ecclesiology, Suárez grounds this heterogeneity in the missional end of the Society of Jesus: she exists for the salvation not only of her members but also of the vast variety of persons throughout the world.

This missional quality of the Society renders essential both a diversity of persons and a diversity of gifts and abilities. For example, Suárez defends the vast learning of the Jesuits in classics, liberal arts, and languages in the framework of mission:

> Among all the religious orders instituted for the salvation of others, without doubt [the Society of Jesus] excels in its manner and especial intention of seeking the salvation of souls, to which end it assumes three principle duties, namely, to spread the Church among nonbelievers and to the most remote nations; to defend the Church against heretics and detractors by laboring for their return to the Church; and to exhort and to teach Catholics themselves by cooperating, as much as possible, for

[120] Introduction, section I.2.

[121] *De religione* 10.1.1.3 (*De religione* 16.1, 555B): *[C]orpus hoc pluribus magisque variis membris constet, quam caetera aliarum religionum, sitque (ut ita dicam) magis heterogenea, quia ille finis, ad quem ordinatur, plura requirit munera, atque etiam plura organa necessaria sunt.*

[122] *De religione* 10.1.3.12 (*Op.* 16.1, 573B): *Ex his vero sequitur diversitas graduum et personarum, quae in toto corpore Societatis cernitur, et inter media ordinata ad salutem merito numerari potest.* Suárez further describes this variety in *De religione* 10.7.1–4 (*Op.* 16.2, 911A–25B). For his description of the Church, see *Defensio fidei* 1.14.7 (*Op.* 24, 72A).

[123] Regarding the Society, see *De religione* 10.4.11 (*Op.* 16.2, 756A): *membra heterogenea unius corporis organici*; regarding the Church, see *De fide* 9.5.3 (*Op.* 12, 261A): *[Paulus] comparat Ecclesiam corpori humano, quod heterogeneum est.*

> their sanctification and perfection. Hence, it is the case that this religious society requires expertise in languages and in all of philosophy and metaphysics, not only for the sake of understanding theology and sacred Scripture, but also so that in other ways it might use such expertise in the service of the faith.[124]

Suárez continues that especially on account of the mission to the nations, excellence in languages is essential. He compares the members of the Society to the Apostles at Pentecost, who received the "gift of tongues" for the sake of preaching the gospel to all peoples. So too, a "religious order which participates in that [apostolic] task, ought to prepare the tools of language with due diligence and studiousness in order to make that task universal as much as possible."[125] And while every member neither need nor could possess all such abilities to the same degree, nevertheless what is lacking in one is made up for "in the body of the Society (*in ipso corpore Societatis*)."[126] Recall that Suárez speaks very similarly of the duties and abilities of the faithful, who fulfill all the various commands of Christ not individually, but "in the body of the Catholic Church (*ipso corpori Ecclesiae catholicae*)."[127] Further, this great diversity in the Church exists for the sake of her mission, which is the salvation of her members and of all people.[128] In a similar way, the diversity of persons and abilities that the Society possesses, indeed her very "universality," exists for her mission to save souls, even to the remotest ends of the earth.

[124] *De religione* 10.5.2.5 (*Op.* 16.2, 808B): *[N]am inter omnes* [*religiones*], *quae ordinantur ad salutem proximorum, sine dubio excellit in modo et praecipua intentione quaerendi salutem animarum, ad quem finem tria principalia munia assumit, scilicet, propagare Ecclesiam inter infideles et quascumque remotissimas nationes; defendere illam ab haereticis et impugnatoribus, pro eorum simul reductione laborando; exhortari et docere ipsos Catholicos, ad eorum sanctificationem et omnem perfectionem, quoad fieri possit, cooperando. Unde fit ut haec religio peritia linguarum et totius philosophiae ac metaphysicae indigeat, non solum propter Theologiae et sacrae Scripturae intelligentiam, sed etiam ut aliis modis ea peritia utatur in fidei obsequium.*

[125] *De religione* 10.5.2.6 (*Op.* 16.2, 809A): *Unde, sicut Spiritus sanctus ob hanc praecipuam causam primis Evangelii praedicatoribus tribuit linguarum donum, ita quando illa signa cesserunt, religio, quae illud munus participat, debita diligentia et industria linguae instrumenta praeparare, et quoad fieri possit, universale efficere debet.* Suárez elsewhere compares the work of the Jesuits to the work of Christ and the Apostles who, he says, became "all things to all people." See *De religione* 10.9.8.2 (*Op.* 16.2, 1045B). He further states that the Society seeks to imitate St. Paul in its ministry, at *De religione* 10.4.7.13 (*Op.* 16.2, 737B).

[126] *De religione* 10.5.2.8 (*Op.* 16.2, 809B): *[L]icet difficile, vel moraliter impossibile sit, omnes illas simul cum theologica doctrina in singulis personis perfecte conjungi, tamen in ipso corpore Societatis esse potest, et procuranda est excellentia et eminentia in omnibus illis.*

[127] *Defensio fidei* 1.14.2 (*Op.* 24, 70A). See chapter 3, section 3.3.3.

[128] See chapter 3, section 3.3.4.

This missional end of the Society of Jesus renders her universal in the fourth sense, namely, universality of place. The Jesuits uniquely profess a fourth vow that promises obedience to the Pope regarding missions.[129] Ignatius once referred to this vow as the "beginning and principal foundation of the Society,"[130] and the *Constitutions* state that the purpose of this vow was "not to designate a particular place but to have the members distributed throughout the various parts of the world."[131] From her origins, the Society existed for the sake of mission, and this radical commitment to mission resulted in a remarkable "universality of place," as it were.[132] In his letters, Ignatius of Loyola frequently refers to the Jesuits as a "dispersed Society," a description Suárez takes up in his defense of the Society.[133] Suárez explains that the fourth vow is "universal, and indifferent to all places and nations, and to whatever religion or opinion," in order that the Society "might be scattered throughout the world in diverse regions and places."[134]

Recall that Suárez distinguished two kinds of universality of place, namely, universality "in fact" and universality "by right." The *fact* of the Society's dissemination is evident from what we have already discussed regarding the "dispersed Society," as well as from Suárez's frequent mentions of the members of the Society living among Muslims, Greeks, Protestants, and those who have never heard the gospel; living in the New World, in the far east, and across Europe.[135] The Society extends to the limits of the known world.

The "right," as it were, of the Society to go on mission stems from two ultimately inseparable sources: her way of life and the authority of the Church. Suárez argues that the mobility and missional *modus vivendi* of the Society "is not altogether accidental or outside the breadth of her institute as it is in other religious orders, but it is *per se* embraced and chosen for the end of the Society."[136] The Society exists for the sake of mission, and this missional end presumes the

[129] On the meaning and various interpretations of this vow, see O'Malley, *The First Jesuits*, 298–301.

[130] *Cons*, 1.162: . . . *principio y principal fundamento*. See O'Malley, *The First Jesuits*, 298–301.

[131] *Constitutions* §605.

[132] William V. Bangert, S.J., *A History of the Society of Jesus* (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1986), 29.

[133] Ignatius, Letters, 69, 70, 74, 75, 117; *EppIgn.*, 1.185, 190, 196, 295.

[134] *De religione* 10.6.4.12 (*Op.* 16.2, 858A–B): *Tertia circumstantia hujus materiae* [*quarti voti*] *est, ut sit universalis, et indifferens ad omnia loca, et ad omnes gentes, cujuscumque religionis seu opinionis . . .* Nec intellexit Societas *(additur in Constitutione)* particularem aliquem locum, sed ut per orbem in diversas regiones et loca spargerentur. See *Constitutions* §605.

[135] See chapter 2.

[136] *De religione* 10.6.4.13 (*Op.* 16.2, 858B): *Ita ut hic videndi modus non sit omnino accidentarius, seu extra latitudinem instituti, sicut esset in aliis religionibus, sed sit per se comprehensus et electus ad finem Societatis.*

appropriate power or right to fulfill that end lest her institute be in vain. At the same time, just as the Society of Jesus lives out her institute as a determination within the society of the Church, so too her missional end is bound to the mission of the Church. The Jesuits uniquely constitute themselves "in the power of the Pope"[137] to send them on mission, and "from no more powerful right (*jure*) and greater direction of the Holy Spirit can [the Jesuits] be sent, than by the Supreme Pastor of Christ's sheep."[138] The "right" of the Jesuits to spread the faith can exist only within the universal and propagative "right" of the Church.

4.4. Conclusion: Jesuit Missions and the Mission of the Church

Following the example of Ignatius of Loyola and his early companions, Suárez considers the institute of the Society of Jesus not only to exist within and for the mission of the Church, but also to imitate that mission "by similitude." The members of the Society, like the Church, profess a Christic unity that binds them together into a "body," while at the same time professing a missional universality that enables them to extend (and descend) to the ends of the earth. The Society of Jesus is thus an ideal expression of the Christological unity and catholicity of the Church.

This relationship between the Church and the Society proves mutually informative. Not only does Suárez's ecclesiology shed light on his defense of the Society, but also his description of the institute of the Society enfleshes his ecclesiology. We have already indicated certain ways in which this is the case, for example, in Suárez's teaching on obedience to authorities and his understanding of familiar conversation as a work of charity. To be clear, Suárez is not suggesting that everything the Society does ought to be done by all the members of the faithful.[139] Indeed, such a conception would undercut his understanding of the body of Christ and catholicity-as-diversity. Rather, the ministries of the Society serve as an ideal expression of the work of the Church.

As an important ministry of the Church, however, the Jesuit institute also sheds a good bit of light on the missional quality of the Church herself. Far from

[137] *De religione* 10.6.4.12 (*Op.* 16.2, 858B).

[138] *De religione* 10.6.4.18 (*Op.* 16.2, 860A): *A nullo autem potiori jure et majori Spiritus Sancti directione mitti possunt, quam a Summo Pastore ovium Christi, ad quem ex officio spectat ovium saluti spirituali intendere.*

[139] Suárez is clear that the ministry of the Jesuits is, in some sense, non-ordinary. See Murphy, "'God's Porters,'" 10, where he cites *De religione* 10.9.3.5 (*Op.* 16.2, 1005B).

the current caricatures depicting the early modern Church as aloof and insular,[140] Suárez's depiction of the Church suggests something altogether different: a way of life that descends to the fringes of society in order to bring all people to salvation. The role of the Jesuits, as instruments of the Church, is to enter into the fallenness of the world, not to flee from it. The Jesuits are to "run about the whole world"[141] engaging in conversation with nonbelievers, heretics, and the ordinary faithful; they ought to deliver the Spiritual Exercises to the laity and provide education to the young and old alike;[142] their preaching ought not be confined to the chapel but taken to the public square.[143] And all of these spiritual ministries fall under the idea of "mission." As Suárez writes, "in the name *missions*, according to the true sense and common way of speaking, are understood not only journeys or residences in other places, but also actions and ministries to which journeys of this kind are ordered."[144] Through her journeys and ministries, the Society of Jesus works for the "perfection" or completion of the Church.

But this mission of both the Society and the Church never neglects the care of those souls already within her number. In his ecclesiology, Suárez refers to this care as "conservation"; in his defense of the Society, as the perfection of her members. The two societies thus share a twofold end: the perfection of their members and the extension of salvation to others. Writing about ecclesial unity in the *Defensio*, Suárez states that "the Church . . . coalesces through the mode of one body out of various members and is conserved through their mutual work and influence among each other."[145] Yet his account of her catholicity, her need to extend to the ends of the earth, suggests that the Church is conserved not only by the influence of the members among each other, but also by their missionary work for the salvation of the world. Suárez's description of the Society sheds light on just how mutually dependent these intensive and extensive impulses can be; indeed, they "mutually determine each other."[146] In other words, the perfection of the individual Jesuit *depends upon* his mission to others and, correlatively, the conservation of the Church *depends upon* her propagation. Insularity is not an option. The Society and the Church must remain bound by the unitive bond

[140] See the introduction to this dissertation and chapter 3, introduction (section 3.1).

[141] *De religione* 10.6.4.13 (*Op.* 16.2, 858B): *. . . huc illucque discurrere . . .*; *De religione* 10.1.4.13 (*Op.* 16.1, 574B): *. . . ad discurrendum per universum orbem.*

[142] See chapter 1, section 1.3.4; *De religione* 10.5.5 (*Op.* 16.2, 824A–30B).

[143] See Murphy's excellent discussion of this in "'God's Porters,'" 11–17, especially 16.

[144] *De religione* 10.6.4.6 (*Op.* 16.2, 856B): *. . . quia nomine missionum juxta verum sensum, et communem usum loquentium, non intelliguntur solum itinera vel residentiae in aliquibus locis, sed actiones etiam et ministeria, ad quae hujusmodi itinera ordinantur.*

[145] *Defensio fidei* 1.7.18 (*Op.* 24, 37A): *[C]onstat hanc Ecclesiam, quae per modum unius corporis ex variis membris coalescit, et per mutuam operam, et influxum eorum inter se conservatur.*

[146] *De religione* 10.1.2.5 (*Op.* 16.1, 562B): *. . . . mutuo sese determinent, et ita ex eis confletur unus adaequatus et perfectissimus finis talis religionis.*

of Christ and a uniform *modus vivendi* lest they destroy what they claim to share. Yet they cannot rest on their efforts toward the perfection of their own members. Like the parable of the talents, what is not given away and multiplied cannot be retained. In order to continue to possess Christ, the two societies must look ever outward to extend their shared mission and namesake to the ends of the world "lest Christ be made poor beyond measure."[147]

[147] *Defensio fidei* 1.4.8 (*Op.* 24, 20A).

Conclusion

Suárez's Ecclesiological Legacy

This book has argued for a reappraisal of the ecclesiology of Francisco Suárez and, with him, the whole of early modern Catholic ecclesiology. Many have accused theologians of the second scholastic of conflating the Church with the nation-state and thereby propounding a rigid and institutional ecclesiology that neglects Christological aspects of the Church.[1] This accusation is far from the truth. Suárez indeed employs the image of a political body to describe the Church, but deconstructs this image almost as swiftly as he employs it. The Church is a "new commonwealth" and a "way of life," a society of the faithful called to spiritual union with Christ by the grace of the Holy Spirit (chapter 1). The Christological unity of the Church and the universal salvific will of God even prompts Suárez to extend the purportedly exclusive boundaries of the Church to include those on the fringes of ecclesial life (chapter 2). The mission of the Church to spread Jesus Christ to the ends of the earth informs her identity and her catholicity, necessitating a spiritual diversity of grades, gifts, and graces so that Christ can indeed become all in all (chapter 3). The radically Christological unity of the Church and her diffusive catholicity find clearest expression in the charism of the Society of Jesus, which imitates the unity and catholicity of the Church in its twofold and mutually determinative purpose to unite and sanctify its own members and to go on mission to spread the gospel to the ends of the earth (chapter 4).

In histories of ecclesiology, attention typically has been paid only to the many treatises *de Ecclesia* that were written after the Council of Trent, and Suárez has unfortunately been little more than a blip on the radar, a footnote to the more extensive but still vastly inadequate attention to his confrère,

[1] See Introduction, section I.1.

Unity and Catholicity in Christ. Eric J. DeMeuse, Oxford University Press. © Oxford University Press 2022.
DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780197638637.003.0006

St. Robert Bellarmine. I have argued that this twofold methodological shortcoming produces a truncated account of Tridentine ecclesiology, and I have shown this both through my attention to a key figure other than Bellarmine (whose ecclesiology, like that of Suárez, warrants another look), and also through examining often overlooked works such as the *De religione*, which serve to enflesh Suárez's ecclesiological vision.

Examining a wider array of early modern authors and genres thus provides a more accurate account of Tridentine ecclesiologies. Nevertheless a third task remains, that of tracing the reception and legacy of these theologians and their works. Since so little attention has been paid to Suárez's ecclesiology, little attention has been paid to his ecclesiological legacy; some wonder whether there is even one of which to speak.[2] A full account of Suárez's theological legacy is beyond the scope of this book. Nevertheless, in the few pages remaining, I hope to begin this project by briefly examining his legacy in two ways. First, I examine the reception of his teaching on the ecclesial status of the children of heretics discussed in chapter 2. Second, I present two ways in which Suárez's understanding of ecclesial unity and catholicity can converse with and contribute to developments in contemporary ecclesiology.

C.1. Suárez's Historical Reception

Many aspects of Suárez's ecclesiological legacy warrant further attention.[3] In what follows, I will trace the reception of Suárez's doctrine on ecclesial unity and membership, and particularly his doctrine on the ecclesial status of heretics

[2] Joseph Clifford Fenton, "The Status of St. Robert Bellarmine's Teaching about the Membership of Occult Heretics in the Catholic Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review* 72, no. 3 (March 1950): 213.

[3] Joaquin Salaverri, "Autoridad de Suárez en el Concilio Vaticano," *Estudios eclesiásticos* 22 (1948): 205–26, chronicles the many invocations of Suárez's theology at the First Vatican Council. Suárez's name also appears twenty-two times in the *Acta Synodalia Concilii Vaticani Secundi*, 25 vols. (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanus, 1970–1996), I/IV, 78, 90; II/I, 638; II/II, 330; II/III, 76, 442, 443; II/IV, 153, 229; II/VI, 249; III/I, 198, 344; III/II, 143, 706; III/III, 598, 600, 602, 605, 857; IV/IV, 107, 482; IV/VI, 145. Among other topics, the Council Fathers invoke him for his teaching on ecclesiological issues such as the episcopate, the *sensus fidelium*, the missions, divine revelation, and religious freedom. Of course, the particular manner in which his teaching is employed in each of these cases warrants further analysis. Nevertheless, a number of these mentions concern what has been discussed in previous chapters. For example, Suárez's doctrine on the necessity of the Church's mission to extend without opposition to the ends of the earth is referenced in *Acta* I/IV, 76–78, as is his teaching on the possibility of implicit faith for salvation in *Acta* IV/IV, 482. He is further invoked regarding the necessity to clarify dogmatically the diverse modes of *communicatio in sacris* that the Decree on Ecumenism proposed to address, in *Acta* II/VI, 249.

and schismatics and their children. I have chosen this particular aspect because I have argued in chapter 2 that this is an important yet often overlooked element of Suárez's ecclesiology, and further because twentieth-century ecumenical developments remain one of the most prominent areas in which modern ecclesiology is contrasted with Tridentine ecclesiology.[4] A brief tracing of Suárez's legacy on this question can serve to lessen this contrast.[5]

Suárez's position on the status of the baptized children of heretics is carried on not only by Juan de Lugo,[6] but also in the magisterial tradition. Pope Benedict XIV (1740–1758) employed the thought of Suárez to maintain the distinction between heretical parents and their children in the eyes of the Church. In his *De synodo diocesana*, Benedict exposits the canonical procedures for dealing with heretics who, having renounced their error and returned to the bosom of the Church, seek Holy Orders. Such persons require a dispensation, he says, yet their children, according to the "fairer and more accepted interpretation" of the canons, do not, once their fathers renounce their error and return to the Church.[7] Benedict cites Suárez's *De censuris* in which the latter argues that "the law wants to make a distinction between those who commit a crime and their children." Suárez notes briefly that the children of heretics already bear certain punishments as a result of their parent's offense, but adds that graver punishments should be inflicted on the one who committed the offense "than on his child."[8] Indeed, Suárez argues, such moderation with children may even help parents to convert more easily (*facilius*). Inheriting this teaching, Benedict maintains the distinction between heretics and schismatics themselves and the children born of, and educated by, them.

Although he admits the reduction of culpability, the children of heretics still seem to be *extra Ecclesiam* for Benedict in his *De synodo diocesana.* But elsewhere the pope makes important strides in the Church's baptismal theology that could suggest otherwise. In his 1749 brief *Singulari nobis* to Cardinal Henry, Duke of

[4] Thomas P. Rausch, S.J., *Towards a Truly Catholic Church: An Ecclesiology for the Third Millennium* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003), 64, describes Tridentine ecclesiology as "not open to ecumenism," in contrast to the ecclesiology of Vatican II.

[5] Parts of this section first appeared in "At the Fringes of the Church: The Ecclesial Status of Heretics and Their Baptized Children in Early Modern Ecclesiology," in *Innovation in Early Modern Catholicism*, ed. Ulrich L. Lehner (London: Routledge, 2021), 111–125.

[6] See chapter 2, section 2.3.4.

[7] Benedict XIV, *De synodo diocesana libri tredecim*, 2 vols. (Rome: Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, 1806), bk. 13, ch. 24, no. 21: *Et quidem pater etiam post ejuratam haeresim irregularitate tenetur, ideoque dispensatione indiget ad Ordines suscipiendos. . . . Irregulares praeterea sunt filii ex haeretico patre geniti. . . . At, relicta a patre haeresi, eoque ad Ecclesiae sinum reverso, filii, juxta aequiorem, et magis receptam interpretationem scribentium in praeindicatos textus, irregularitate solvuntur. Ita etiam docet Suarez de Censuris disput. 43, sect. 3.*

[8] *De censuris* 43.3.1 (*Op.* 23.2, 414B).

York, Benedict states that "when a heretic baptizes someone, provided he uses the legitimate form and matter . . . the latter is marked with the baptismal character."[9] Benedict goes on in section 13: "[S]omeone who has received valid baptism from a heretic is made a member of the Catholic Church by virtue of that (baptism); for the personal error of the one baptizing cannot deprive him of this happiness," adding that Suárez "affirms this admirably" in the passage we cited (*Defensio fidei* 1.24.2–3; chapter 2, section 2.3.4), "where he proves that the person baptized becomes a member of the Catholic Church, also adding this, that if the heretic, as often happens, christens an infant unable to make an act of faith, this is no obstacle to his receiving the habit of faith at baptism."[10] Following Suárez, Benedict affirms that all those validly baptized are baptized into the Catholic Church and become members (*Ecclesiae membrum*). They cease to become members, Benedict asserts, "if they reach the age at which they can distinguish right from wrong for themselves and then adhere to the errors of the one who baptized them." Such persons are then "rejected from the unity of the Church (*ab Ecclesiae unitate repelli*)."[11]

In the nineteenth century, the legacy of Suárez, mediated through Lugo, is evident in the Austrian Jesuit Johann Baptist Franzelin (1816–1886). In his posthumously published *Theses de Ecclesia Christi*, Franzelin treats explicitly and at length the case of those born into heretical or schismatic communities. Of their baptism he writes, "Not only are they marked with the character of Christ, but even are reborn as children of God through grace and are incorporated into holy mother Church, a member of which they remain at least in the internal forum and in the sight of God for as long as they do not adhere to the heresy or schism with a proper act (which is a mortal sin)." Franzelin maintains Benedict XIV's strong stance on baptism as the door of ecclesial membership even in heretical communities, noting with Augustine that "mother Church generates sons not only through her own womb, but even through the womb of handmaidens." But he also employs a distinction between the internal and external forums in order to deal with the problem posed by the fact that such individuals still live, by all appearances, apart from the Catholic Church. The same people baptized into heretical communities may belong to the Church "in the internal forum" (*in foro interno*), however, "in the external forum" (*in foro externo*) they are considered "material heretics" and are excluded from the Church despite their "inculpable

[9] Benedict, *De synodo diocesana*, bk. 7, ch. 6, no. 7, places the burden of proof largely on those doubting the validity of a heretical baptism to show "some innovation" concerning the matter and form of baptism.

[10] Benedict XIV, Brief *Singulari nobis* to Cardinal Henry, Duke of York (Feb. 9, 1749) (DH §2567).

[11] Ibid. (DH §2568).

ignorance."[12] If such persons still persist in a heretical sect after attaining the full use of reason, they are presumed heretics. Yet drawing on the thought of Juan de Lugo, Franzelin argues that they may not yet be heretics if the Catholic faith has not been sufficiently presented to them.[13]

In the twentieth century, these theological developments on the ecclesial status of the baptized children of heretics and schismatics would be widely discussed on the eve of Vatican II. For example, Pope Benedict's *Singulari nobis* played an important role in Louis Richard's article arguing for visible incorporation into the Church by baptism (as a minimal unity) and the import of this thesis for ecumenism,[14] and Henri de Lubac deemed *Singulari nobis* "and the commentary on this by Fr. Louis Richard" an argument for degrees of incorporation into the Church.[15] These speculations anticipate the Second Vatican Council's Decree on Ecumenism (*Unitatis Redintegratio*), which makes official the distinction borne from centuries of theological speculation, and advances this distinction into a theology of degrees of communion:

> The children who are born into . . . [separated] Communities and who grow up believing in Christ cannot be accused of the sin involved in the separation, and the Catholic Church embraces them as brothers with respect and affection. For men who believe in Christ and have been truly baptized are in communion with the Catholic Church even though this communion is imperfect.[16]

The Council here extends the language employed by Suárez when discussing mortal sinners (*unio imperfecta*) to include the baptized children born into separated communities (*communione non perfecta*), and further clarifies and advances the distinction Suárez made in the *Defensio fidei* and *De religione* between heretics and schismatics and their baptized children. One reason that the Council is able to extend union with the Church in this way is because of

[12] Johann Baptist Franzelin, *Theses de Ecclesia Christi* (Rome: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S. Congr. De Propaganda fide, 1907), 394.

[13] Ibid., 395–96.

[14] Louis Richard, "Une thèse fondamentale de l'oecuménisme: le baptême, incorporation visible à l'Église," *Nouvelle revue théologique* 74 (1952): 485–92. Richard also cites Suárez in this article on a different but related point.

[15] Henri de Lubac, S.J., *The Splendor of the Church*, trans. Michael Mason (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999 [first French edition 1953]), 113, fn. 119. Karl Rahner opposes this understanding of *Singulari nobis* and the interpretation of Richard in an early article on "Membership of the Church According to the Teaching of Pius XII's Encyclical 'Mystici Corporis Christi,'" *Theological Investigations*, vol. 2, trans. Karl-Heinz Kruger (Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963).

[16] *Unitatis Redintegratio* §3 (DH §4188).

its explicit framework of "degrees" of communion/incorporation; an explicit framework that Suárez did not develop in his own time but he certainly began to grapple with, however inchoately. Nevertheless, at least in this case of ecumenical significance, the purported chasm between the ecclesiology of Vatican II and that of the Tridentine era significantly narrows.

C.2. Suárez's Contribution to Contemporary Ecclesiology

Suárez's ecclesiology serves as a reminder both to reassess the past and to understand how this rediscovered heritage can inform the present. In this section, I outline two ways in which Suárez's ecclesiology can contribute to the current ecclesiological conversation, namely, in his definition of the Church as a *congregatio fidelium* (chapters 1 and 2) and in his understanding of the mutually determinative mission of the Church to conserve and to propagate itself (chapters 3 and 4).

The very act of defining the Church, so prevalent in early modern ecclesiology and evident in Suárez, endured scrutiny in the twentieth century. Yves Congar famously argued that a definition of the Church "according to the rules of formal logic" is simply not possible both because the reality of the Church is too rich to be contained in a single concept, and because the Church is a substantially supernatural reality and cannot be adequately accounted for by the adaptation of sociological categories.[17] The biblical witness suggests as much with its plurality of terms and images for the Church.[18] Avery Dulles adopts a similar attitude toward ecclesial definition in his *Models of the Church.* But more recently, Joseph A. Komonchak has expressed reservations about this tendency to eschew definition. Directly addressing the method employed by Dulles, Komonchak writes that "[his] whole book . . . leaves unstated what it is these models are of. . . . It is as if everyone knows what is meant by 'the Church,' as if the object of ecclesiology is so obvious that it does not need to be stated."[19] Komonchak thinks that "the uniqueness of the Church in her theological mystery does not preclude but in fact requires exploration of what she may have in common with other human communities."[20] Indeed, Komonchak even goes so far as to suggest that the term

[17] Yves Congar, O.P., "Peut-on définir l'Église?: Destin et valeur de quatre notions qui s'offrent à le faire," in *Sainte Église: Études et approaches ecclésiologiques* (Paris: Cerf, 1963), 41–42.

[18] Ibid., 21.

[19] Joseph A. Komonchak, *Who Are the Church?: The Père Marquette Lecture in Theology 2008* (Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2008), 25.

[20] Ibid., 15.

congregatio fidelium in reference to the Church "is more than a nominal definition. . . . It approximates a real definition, that is, a statement of what constitutes and distinguishes the gathering of human beings known as the Church."[21]

In response to the twentieth-century emphasis on the Church as "mystery,"[22] Komonchak worries that discourse on the Church has become *too* mysterious and ethereal, divorced from the lived reality of the pilgrim Church. The Church is something supernatural, indeed; but insofar as the Church is constituted of human beings following the Lord Jesus in faith, it is also something sociological. *Congregatio fidelium* is a definition of the Church that encompasses, for Komonchak, the theological and sociological reality of the Church. It encompasses the theological because supernatural faith is the beginning of human salvation and life in the Church. It encompasses the sociological because faith is that first shared reality which unites the members of the ecclesial community together in a particular way of life (*congregatio*).[23]

While Congar and Dulles do evidence a desire to synthesize ecclesial models and admit that certain models are more comprehensive than others, neither go as far as Komonchak in the attempt to establish a fundamental ecclesial model upon which other models build; or, perhaps better put, which all other models inhabit.[24] Komonchak's contribution to the question *quid est Ecclesia* reflects, I argue, a contemporary resurgence of the very concerns of the early modern Catholic theologians, and Suárez in particular. Suárez presents the Church as a *congregatio fidelium* and a "political body" in order to ground the reality of the Church in the sociological and the visible. Nevertheless, as I demonstrated in chapters 1 and 2, Suárez's emphasis on the social and visible is not employed at the expense of the supernatural and divine element in the Church. For Suárez, the Church is the "new commonwealth" because it is joined by the supernatural bonds of faith and charity through which Christ inhabits our hearts. Her way of life stems not from mere natural consent but from the gift of faith, her governance operates under the guidance of the Holy Spirit for the salvation of souls, and her law contains not only the rules to follow but the grace to fulfill them. For Suárez, as for Komonchak, the definition of the Church as a *congregatio fidelium* embraces both the human and divine elements of the Church. Of course, Suárez goes further than Komonchak in offering a "definition," in his words, rather than offering something that "approximates a definition." Yet even for Suárez, the divine element in the Church can never, properly speaking, be defined, just

[21] Ibid., 31.

[22] This appellation of the Church was a central theme of *Lumen Gentium*, evident in the title of the first chapter, "De Ecclesiae mysterio" (DH §4101).

[23] Komonchak, *Who Are the Church?*, 31.

[24] Congar, "Peut-on définir l'Église," 40–43; Dulles, *Models of the Church*, 198.

as for Suárez God can never be defined.[25] Thus even Suárez's position is perhaps better stated in the phrase of Komonchak: the term *congregatio fidelium* "approximates" a real definition since it includes both the human element in the Church (*congregatio*) and what distinguishes this human element from other congregations, namely supernatural faith, even if the divine element remains ultimately undefined. In short, the definition of the Church always contains an undefinable term.[26]

Closely linked with the nature and definition of the Church is the question of her "universal mission."[27] Over the past century, theologians have put heightened emphasis on the essential role of mission in ecclesial identity. Mission is not an ancillary quality of the Church but something that both proceeds from and informs her very nature and, in particular, her very *catholicity.*[28] In the words of Henri de Lubac, "Missionary work will therefore not be a superogatory [*sic*] work, it will not be as if on the periphery of the Church's activity: it is her primary work."[29] Such increased reflection on the role of mission in the Church has given birth to "missional ecclesiologies" that seek to investigate the manner in which the Church is called not only to diffuse herself, but also, in imitation of Christ, to become incarnate in every culture.[30] In this context, debates have surfaced regarding the degree to which she can or should empty herself for the sake of the nations. The Church must remain *one universal reality.* But how can this one universal reality be diffused *to every particular culture and people* without being dissipated? It is in this context that the debate between "ecclesiocentrism,"[31] which sees the Church as not only a means but the end of missionary activity,

[25] God cannot be defined because God is "not a genus." John Kronen, "Suárez's Influence on Protestant Scholasticism: The Cases of Hollaz and Turretin," in *A Companion to Francisco Suárez*, ed. Victor M. Salas and Robert L. Fastiggi (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 240.

[26] I am indebted to Fr. Joseph Mueller, S.J., for these insights.

[27] *Lumen Gentium* 1 (DH §4101) makes this connection immediately when it speaks of the Church's *naturam missionemque suam universalem.*

[28] Vatican II's decree *Ad Gentes* 1, http://www.vatican.va, states that the Church's missionary activity is "driven by the inner necessity of her own catholicity" (*ex intimis propriae catholicitatis exigentiis*). As Henri de Lubac, S.J., "The Theological Foundation of the Missions," in *Theology in History*, trans. Anne Englund Nash (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1996), 381, succinctly puts it, "Dynamic catholicity and missionary impulse: there is no difference between the two."

[29] De Lubac, "The Theological Foundation of the Missions," 369.

[30] Examples include Antonio Spadaro and Carlos María Galli, eds., *For a Missionary Reform of the Church: The* Civiltà Cattolica *Seminar*, trans. Demetrio S. Yocum (New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 2017); Eugene R. Schlesinger, *Missa est! A Missional Liturgical Ecclesiology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017).

[31] De Lubac, "The Theological Foundation of the Missions," 391, proves an illustrative example of ecclesiocentrism.

and "seculocentrism,"[32] which instrumentalizes the Church for the sake of accomplishing certain humanitarian ends of the *saecula*, arises.

Answers to such questions do not come easily, and while Suárez clearly inhabits the "ecclesiocentric" camp, his thought provides no ready solution to the divide. Nevertheless, I have argued that Suárez defends a "missional catholicity," considering mission to be essential to the nature of the Church. Thus, perhaps Suárez can serve as an interlocutor in contemporary discussions regarding missional ecclesiology. Suárez sees no tension between the conservative and propagative impulses of the Church. Indeed, his very theology of catholicity demonstrates that the variety within, and the diffusion of, the Church requires a uniform *ratio credendi* that binds together the diverse members of the Church in faith and *religio.* The Church cannot "empty" herself of those features which make her a single, distinct, and supernatural "way of life," namely faith, charity, and religion, even though she can permit diverse expressions of these elements to a degree. But at the same time, the members of the Church can never rest content in possession of their faith, charity, and religion, lest Christ be made poor beyond measure. It is the role of the Church to "run about the whole world," to descend into the public square, to engage in familiar conversation, and to give herself as an offering of obedience and charity for the salvation of the world. The Church must be missionary if she is to be one and holy, for the Church receives Christ, the universal savior, as her defining treasure only to the extent that she shares him with as many as possible "until the consummation of the saints." To borrow Suárez's description of the Jesuit charism, the conservative and propagative missions of the Church "mutually determine" each other in order that Christ may indeed become all in all.

The mutual determination of the Church's various aspects runs through the very heart of Suárez's ecclesiological vision. He permits no bifurcation between the Church as a "way of life" and the Church as a hierarchy and law (chapter 1); the Church as rigorously united in faith and the Church as extending even to those who have never heard the gospel (chapter 2); the Church as most uniform and the Church as most heterogeneous (chapter 3). As we have seen in his debates with both Catholic and Protestant contemporaries and particularly his polemic with James I, the de-emphasis of any one of these elements makes

[32] Schlesinger, *Missa Est!,* 27–48, outlines radical critiques of ecclesiocentrism such as that of Johannes Christiaan Hoekendijk, but less radical critiques are evident even in the work of Catholics such as Francis A. Sullivan, "The Evangelizing Mission of the Church," in *The Gift of the Church: A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.*, ed. Peter C. Phan (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 247, who unmoors missionary work from the motive to make others members of the Church, arguing instead that, while conversions can still be a part of missionary work, the humanitarian work of the Church spreads God's reign just as much, and thus "[missionaries] have no need to worry if their preaching results in few conversions and baptisms."

the Church a distortion rather than a true image of Christ. As in the icon of the Pantocrator at Sinai, each element must retain its distinct and startling character for the image to prove whole, true, and compelling. Only through living her unity and catholicity in its fullness can the Church be a sacrament to the nations and call all people into the fellowship of the Lord, the *societas Iesu*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Sources

Andrewes, Lancelot. *Selected Sermons and Lectures.* Edited by Peter McCullough. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Aristotle. *The Complete Works of Aristotle.* 2 vols. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Athanasius. *Adversus Arianos oratio prima*. In *Patrologia Graeca* 26. Edited by J.P. Migne. Paris: Garnier, 1857.

Augustine. *De fide et operibus.* In *Patrologia Latina* 40. Edited by J.P. Migne. Paris: Garnier, 1865.

Bañez, Domingo, O.P. *Commentaria in secundam secundae angelici doctoris D.* Thomae. Venice: Bernardus Iunta, 1586.

Bañez, Domingo, O.P. *Comentarios ineditos a la Tercera Parte de Santo Tomas.* Vol. 2, part 1. Madrid: 1953.

Bellarmine, Robert, S.J. *Controversies of the Christian Faith*. Translated by Kenneth Baker, S.J. Ramsey, NJ: Keep the Faith, 2016.

Bellarmine, Robert, S.J. *De controversiis Christianae fidei adversus huius temporis hæreticos.* 4 vols. Venice: Joannem Malachinum, 1721.

Bellarmine, Robert, S.J. *On the Church Militant.* Translated by Ryan Grant. Lexington, KY: Mediatrix Press, 2016.

Bellarmine, Robert, S.J. *On the Marks of the Church*. Translated by Ryan Grant. Lexington, KY: Mediatrix Press, 2015.

Benedict XIV. *De synodo diocesana libri tredecim.* 2 vols. Rome: Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, 1806.

Biel, Gabriel. *Canonis misse expositio.* Edited by Heiko Oberman and William J. Courtenay. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1963.

Cajetan, Tommaso de Vio, O.P. *Angelici doctoris S. Thomae Aquinatis Summa theologica, cum commentariis Thomae de Vio Card. Cajetani et Elicidationibus Litteralibus P. Seraphini Capponi a Porrecta, Ordinis Praedicatorum: Tomus Septimus continens Tertiae partis volumen primum.* Rome: 1773.

Cajetan, Tommaso de Vio, O.P. *Cajetan Responds: A Reader in Reformation Controversy*. Edited and translated by Jared Wicks, S.J. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2011.

Cajetan, Tommaso de Vio, O.P. *De comparatione authoritatis papae & concilii.* In *Opuscula Omnia.* Antwerp: Ioannem Keerbergium, 1612.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Translated by Henry Boveridge. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2008.

Cano, Melchior, O.P. *De locis theologicis libri duodecim*. Louvain: Servatius Sassenus, 1564.

Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. Translated by Rev. H. J. Schroeder, O.P. St. Louis/London: B. Herder Book, 1941.

Casaubon, Isaac. *Anglican Catholicity Vindicated against Roman Innovations in the Answer of Isaac Casaubon to Carinal Perron*. Edited by W. R. Whittingham and Hall Harrison. Baltimore: Turnbull Brothers, [1612] 1875.

Castro, Alfonso de, O.F.M. *De iusta haereticorum punitione*. Salamanca: Ioannes Giunta, 1547.

Catherine of Siena. *The Dialogue of the Seraphic Virgin Catherine of Siena*. Translated by Algar Thorold. Westminster, MD: Newman, 1943.

Catherine of Siena. *L'opere di S. Caterina da Siena.* Vol. 2. Edited by Girolamo Gigli. Lucca: Leonardi Venturini, 1721.

Cicero. *On Invention, The Best Kind of Orator, Topics*. Translated by H. M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library 386. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Cicero. *On the Nature of the Gods, Academics*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 268. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Chemnitz, Martin. *Examen concilii Tridentini*. Berlin: Schlawitz, 1861.

Chemnitz, Martin. *Theologiae Iesuitarum praecipua capita*. Leipzig: 1563.

Collegii Salmanticensis. *Cursus theologicus*. Vol. 14. Paris/Brussels: Victor Palmé/J. Albanel, 1879.

Dante. *Paradiso*. Translated by Robert Hollander and Jean Hollander. New York: Anchor, 2007.

Gerhard, Johann. *Loci theologici*. Berlin: Gust. Schlawitz, 1867.

Gerhard, Johann. *On the Church. Theological Commonplaces XXV.* Translated by Richard J. Dinda. Edited by Benjamin T. G. Mayes. St. Louis: Concordia, 2010.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Hosius, Stanislaus. *Confessio fidei catholicae christiana*. Dillingen: 1557.

Ignatius of Loyola. *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*. Translated by George E. Ganss, S.J. St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1970.

Ignatius of Loyola. *Personal Writings*. Translated by Joseph A. Munitiz and Philip Endean. New York: Penguin, 1996.

Ignatius of Loyola. *The Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius of Loyola*. Translated by Elizabeth Meier Tetlow. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987.

Ignatius of Loyola. *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius.* Translated by Louis J. Puhl, S.J. Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1957.

James I. *The Political Works of James I*. Edited by Charles Howard McIlwain. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1918.

Jesuit Pedagogy: 1540–1616. Edited by Cristiano Casalini and Claude Pavur, S.J. Boston: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2016.

Kolb, Robert, and Timothy J. Wengert, eds. *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.* Translated by Charles Arand et al. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

Lugo, Juan de, S.J. *Disputationes scholasticae et morales, De virtute fidei divinae*. Lyon: 1656.

Luther, Martin. *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe.* Weimar: Hermann Boehlau, 1883–1983.

Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works.* American Edition. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehman. 55 vols. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1955–1967.

Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu. Vol. 141. *Monumenta Paedagogica.* Vol. 7. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1992.

Opstraet, Jan. *De locis theologicis dissertationes decem*. Venice: Balleioniana, 1769.

Orlandini, Niccolò. *Historiae Societatis Jesu: Pars Prima Sive Ignatius.* Edited by Francis Sacchini. Antwerp: Filios Martini Nutii, 1620.

Pius V. *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*. Translated by John A. McHugh, O.P., and Charles J. Callan, O.P. New York: Joseph F. Wagner, 1936.

Pius V. *Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini ad parachos*. Rome: Paulus Manutius, 1566.

Pseudo-Dionysius. *The Complete Works*. Translated by Colm Luibheid. New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1987.

Quenstedt, Johann Andreas. *The Church.* Translated by Luther Poellot. Malone, TX: Repristination Press, 1999.

Quenstedt, Johann Andreas. *Theologia didactico-polemica*. Wittenberg: Johannis Ludolphi Quenstedii, 1685.

Scholarius, Gennadius. *Georgiu tu Scholariu hapanta ta heuriskomena/Oeuvres complètes de Georges Scholarios*. Edited by M. Jugie, L. Petit, and X.A. Siderides. 8 vols. Paris: Maison de la Bonne, 1928–1936.

Stapleton, Thomas. *A Fortresse of the Faith*. Antwerp: Ihon Laet, 1565.

Stapleton, Thomas. *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium demonstratio methodica*. Paris: Michael Sonnius, 1582.

Stapleton, Thomas. *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium relectio scholastica & compendaria*. Antwerp: Ioannes Keerbergius, 1596.

Suárez, Francisco, S.J. *Defense of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith against the Errors of Anglicanism.* 2 vols. Translated by Peter L. P. Simpson. New York: Lucairos Occasio, 2012-13.

Suárez, Francisco, S.J. *Los Ejercicios Espirituales de San Ignacio: Una Defensa.* Edited by Josep Giménez Melià, S.J. Bilbao: Mensajero, 2003.

Suárez, Francisco, S.J. *Lectiones de Fide*. *Biblioteca teologica Granadina.* Edited by Carolus Deuringer. Granada: Facultad de Teologia, 1967.

Suárez, Francisco, S.J. *The Religious State: A Digest of the Doctrine of Suárez Contained in His Treatise "De statu religionis."* 3 vols. Edited and translated by William Humphrey, S.J. London/New York: Burns and Oates, 1884.

Suárez, Francisco, S.J. *Selections from Three Works.* Edited by Thomas Pink. Translated by Gwladys L. Williams, Ammi Brown, John Waldrom, and Henry Davis, S.J. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2015.

Suárez, Francisco, S.J. "What Kind of Corporeal or Political Life Men Would Have Professed in the State of Innocence." Translated by Matthew T. Gaetano. *Journal of Markets & Morality* 15, no. 2 (Fall 2012): 527–63.

Thomas Aquinas. *Commentary on the Letters of Saint Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians.* Edited by J. Mortensen and E. Alarcón. Translated by F. R. Larcher, O.P., and M. L. Lamb. Lander, WY: The Aquinas Institute for the Study of Sacred Doctrine, 2012.

Thomas Aquinas. *Opera Omnia*. Edited by Enrique Alcarón. Pamplona: University of Navarre, 2000–2013. www.corpusthomisticum.org.

Thomas Aquinas. *Scriptum super sententiis Magistri Petri Lombardi*. Edited by Maria Fabianus Moos, O.P. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1933.

Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologiae*. Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benziger Bros., 1947.

Torquemada, Juan de, O.P. *Summa de Ecclesia*. Venice, 1561.

Valencia, Gregory de, S.J. *Analysis Fidei Catholicae*. Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1605.

Vásquez, Gabriel, S.J. *Commentaria ad disputationes in (partes) S. Thomae*. 8 vols. Anwerp: Belleros, 1621.

Vitoria, Francisco de. *Relectiones theologiae*. Lyons: Peter Landry, 1586.

Vitoria, Francisco de. *Vitoria: Political Writings*. Edited by Anthony Pagden and Jeremy Lawrence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Xavier, Francis, S.J. *The Letters and Instructions of Francis Xavier*. Translated by M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J. St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1992.

Contemporary Sources

Agamben, Giorgio. *Opus Dei: An Archaeology of Duty*. Translated by Adam Kotsko. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013.

Alberigo, Giuseppe. "Die Ekklesiologie des Konzils von Trient." In *Concilium Tridentinum*, edited by Remigius Bäumer, 278–300. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1979.

Alberigo, Giuseppe, and Emily Michelson. "From the Council of Trent to 'Tridentinism.'" In *From Trent to Vatican II: Historical and Theological Investigations*, edited by Raymond F. Bulman, Frederick J. Parrella, and Jill Raitt, 19–37. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Alcáin, José Antonio. *La tradición*. Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto, 1998.

André-Vincent, Ph.-L., O.P. "L'intuition fondamentale de las Casas et la Doctrine de Saint Thomas." *Nouvelle revue theologique* 96, no. 9 (November 1974): 944–52.

Astrain, Antonio, S.J. *Historia de la Conpañia de Jesús en la asistencia de España.* 7 vols. Madrid: Rázon y Fe, 1912–1925.

Bach, Oliver, Norbert Brieskorn, and Gideon Stiening, eds. *"Auctoritas omnium legum": Francisco Suárez'* De legibus *zwischen Theologie, Philosophie und Jurisprudenz*. Stuttgart–Bad Cannstatt: Frommann Holzboog, 2013.

Balthasar, Hans Urs. *The Christian State of Life*. Translated by Mary Frances McCarthy. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1983.

Bangert, William V. *A History of the Society of Jesus.* 2nd ed. St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1986.

Becker, Karl J., and Ilaria Morali, eds. *Catholic Engagement with World Religions*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2010.

Bertrand, Dominique. "The Society of Jesus and the Church Fathers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century." In *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*. Vol. 2., edited by Irena Backus, 889–950. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Bireley, Robert. *The Refashioning of Catholicism, 1450–1700*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999.

Blanchard, Shaun. *The Synod of Pistoia and Vatican II: Jansenism and the Struggle for Catholic Reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Bloom, Paul Richard, ed. *Philosophers of the Renaissance*. Translated by Brian McNeil. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010.

Buckley, Michael J., S.J. "The Study of Religion and the Rise of Atheism: Conflict or Confirmation?" In *Fields of Faith: Theology and Religious Studies for the Twenty-first Century*, edited by David F. Ford, Ben Quash, and Janet Martin Soskice, 3–24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Campbell, Thomas Joseph. *The Jesuits, 1534–1921: A History of the Society of Jesus from Its Foundation to the Present Time.* New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1921.

Castillo, José M.S.J. *La afectividad en los Ejercicios según la teologia de Francisco Suárez*. Granada: Archivo Teológico Granadino, 1965.

Chadwick, Owen. *From Bossuet to Newman*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Chesterton, G. K. *Orthodoxy*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1945.

Collinson, Patrick. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Congar, Yves, O.P. *Divided Christendom: A Catholic Study of the Problem of Reunion*. Translated by M. A. Bousfield. London: The Centenary Press, 1939.

Congar, Yves, O.P. *L'Église de saint Augustin à l'époque moderne*. Paris: Cerf, 1970.

Congar, Yves, O.P. "The Idea of the Church in Thomas Aquinas." In *The Mystery of the Church*, translated by A. V. Littledale, 53–74. Baltimore: Helicon, 1960.

Congar, Yves, O.P. "Peut-on définir l'Église?: Destin et valeur de quatre notions qui s'offrent à le faire." In *Sainte Église: Études et approaches ecclésiologiques*, 22–44. Paris: Cerf, 1963.

Congar, Yves, O.P. "Schisme." In *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, edited by A. Vacant et al., 1286–1312. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1939.

Coujou, Jean-Paul. "Political Thought and Legal Theory in Suárez." In *A Companion to Francisco Suárez*, edited by Victor M. Salas and Robert L. Fastiggi, 29–71. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Courel, François, S.J. "La fin unique de la Compagnie de Jésus." *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* 35 (1966): 186–211.

Cultrera, Francisco, S.J. "L'obbligo di seguire la vocazione religiosa nel 'De religione' di Francisco Suarez." PhD diss., Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1967.

DeMeuse, Eric J. "At the Fringes of the Church: The Ecclesial Status of Heretics and Their Baptized Children in Early Modern Ecclesiology." In *Innovation in Early Modern Catholicism*, edited by Ulrich L. Lehner, 111–125. London: Routledge, 2021.

DeMeuse, Eric J. "*Nostre Philon:* Philo after Trent." *Studia Philonica Annual* 29 (2017): 87–109.

DeMeuse, Eric J. "Spanish Jesuits and 'the Greeks': Reception and Perception of the Eastern Church in Luis de Molina, Francisco Suárez, and Gabriel Vásquez." *Journal of Theological Studies* 69, no. 1 (April 2018): 133–69.

DeMeuse, Eric J. '"The World Is Content with Words': Jansenism between Thomism and Calvinism.'" In *Beyond Dordt and De Auxiliis*: *The Dynamics of Protestant and Catholic Soteriology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, edited by Jordan J. Ballor, Matthew T. Gaetano, and David S. Sytsma, 245–76. Studies in the History of Christian Traditions 192. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Deuringer, K. *Die Lehre vom Glauben beim jungen Suarez*. Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1941.

The Documents of Vatican II. Edited by Walter M. Abbott, S.J. Piscataway, NJ: America Press, 1966.

Dulles, Avery, S.J. *The Assurance of Things Hoped For: A Theology of Christian Faith*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Dulles, Avery, S.J. *The Catholicity of the Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Dulles, Avery, S.J. *Church and Society: The McGinley Lectures, 1988–2007*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008.

Dulles, Avery, S.J. *Models of the Church*. New York: Image, 2014.

Dumont, Christophe. "Concept of Schism." In *Sacramentum Mundi: An Encyclopedia of Theology*, edited by Karl Rahner et al., 6:6–8. New York: Herder and Herder, 1970.

Doyle, John P. "Francisco Suárez: On Preaching the Gospel to People like the American Indians." *Fordham International Law Journal* 15, no. 4 (1991): 879–951.

Doyle, John P. "Prolegomena to a Study of Extrinsic Denomination in the Work of Francisco Suárez, S.J." In *Collected Studies on Francisco Suárez, S.J. (1548–1617)*, edited by Victor M. Salas, 123–160. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2010.

Eire, Carlos M. N. *Reformations*. New Haven, CT/London: Yale University Press, 2016.

Endo, Shusaku. *Silence*. Translated by William Johnston. New York: Picador, 1969.

England, John. *The Works of the Right Rev. John England*. Volume 1. Baltimore: John Murphy, 1849.

Ernst, Wilhelm. *Die Tugendlehre des Franz Suarez, mit einer Edition seiner römischen Vorlesung "De habitibus in communi."* Leipzig: St.-Benno-Verlag, 1964.

Fastiggi, Robert. "Francisco Suárez as Dogmatic Theologian." In *A Companion to Francisco Suárez*, edited by Victor Salas and Robert Fastiggi, 148–63. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Fenton, Joseph Clifford. "Membership in the Church." *American Ecclesiastical Review* 112, no. 4 (1945): 287–305.

Fenton, Joseph Clifford. "The Status of St. Robert Bellarmine's Teaching about the Membership of Occult Heretics in the Catholic Church." *American Ecclesiastical Review* 122, no. 3 (March 1950): 207–21.

Fenton, Joseph Clifford. "The Use of the Terms Body and Soul with Reference to the Catholic Church." *American Ecclesiastical Review* 110 (January 1944): 48–57.

Fichter, Joseph H., S.J. *Man of Spain: Francisco Suárez*. New York: Macmillan, 1940.

Fiel, Ernst. "From the Classical *Religio* to the Modern *Religion*: Elements of a Transformation between 1550 and 1650." In *Religion in History: The Word, the Idea, the Reality*, edited by Michel Despland and Gérard Vallée, 31–43. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1992.

Fiel, Ernst. *Religio: Zweiter Band; Die Geschichte eines neuzeitlichen Grundbegriffs zwischen Reformation und Rationalismus (ca. 1540–1620)*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Forlivesi, Marco. "Francisco Suárez and the *rationes studiorum* of the Society of Jesus." In *Francisco Suárez and His Legacy: The Impact of Suárezian Metaphysics and Epistemology on Modern Philosophy*, edited by Marco Sgarbi, 77–90. Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2010.

Foss, Jerome C. "Francisco Suárez and the Religious Basis for Toleration." *Perspectives on Political Science* 42, no. 2 (2013): 94–102.

Franzelin, Johann Baptist. *Theses de Ecclesia Christi*. Rome: Ex Typographia Polyglotta S. Congr. De Propaganda fide, 1907.

Gaetano, Matthew T. "Renaissance Thomism at the University of Padua, 1465–1583." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2013.

Gaillardetz, Richard R. *The Church in the Making: Lumen Gentium, Christus Dominus, Orientalium Ecclesiarum*. New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2006.

Garcia, Jorge J. E. "Francisco Suárez: The Man in History." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 65, no. 3 (1991): 259–66.

Garrigou-Lagrange, Réginald, O.P. *Christ the Savior: A Commentary on the Third Part of St. Thomas' Theological Summa*. Translated by Dom Bede Rose. St. Louis: Herder, 1950.

Gierke, Otto. *Political Theories of the Middle Age*. Translated by Frederic William Maitland. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900.

González, Francisco María Aguilera. *El concepto de teología en el Padre Francisco Suárez*. Mexico: Universidad Iberoamericana, 2000.

Grabmann, Martin. *Thomas Aquinas: His Personality and Thought*. Translated by Virgil Michel, O.S.B. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1928.

Grillmeier, Aloys. "The Mystery of the Church." In *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*. Vol. 1. Translated by Lalit Adolphus, Kevin Smyth, and Richard Strachan, 138–152. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

Guibert, Joseph de. *The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice: A Historical Study*. Translated by William J. Young, S.J. Edited by George E. Ganss, S.J. Chicago: The Institute of Jesuit Resources, 1964.

Guillon, Marie Joseph de. "History of Ecclesiology." In *Sacramentum Mundi*. Vol. 1, edited by Karl Rahner et al., 313–17. New York/London: Herder and Herder/Burns and Oates, 1968.

Hall, Edwin, and Horst Uhr. "*Aureola super Auream*: Crowns and Related Symbols of Special Distinction for Saints in Late Gothic and Renaissance Iconography." *The Art Bulletin* 67, no. 4 (December 1985): 567–603.

Hatheyer, Franz. "Die Lehre des P. Suárez über Beschauung und Exstase." In *P. Franz Suarez S.J.: Gedenkblätter zu seinem dreihundertjährigen Todestag (25. September 1917)*, edited by Karl Six, 75–122. Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1917.

Heider, Daniel, ed. *Cognitive Psychology in Early Jesuit Scholasticism*. New York: Routledge, 2017.

Himes, Michael J. "The Development of Ecclesiology: Modernity to the Twentieth Century." In *The Gift of the Church: A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.*, edited by Peter C. Phan, 45–68. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

Hofmann, Linus. "Die Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche nach der Lehre des Franz Suarez." *Trierer theologische Zeitschrift* 67 (1958): 146–61.

Höpfl, Harro. *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540–1630*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Hörst, Ulrich, O.P. "Die Ekklesiologie des 'Cursus Theologicus Salmanticensis.'" *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 69, nos. 1–2 (1974): 46–67.

Hsia, Ronnie Po-chia, ed. *A Companion to Early Modern Catholic Global Missions*. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

John Paul II. *Codex Iuris Canonici*. Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1983.

Journet, Charles. *L'Église du Verbe incarné*. Vol. 2. *Sa structure interne et son unité catholique*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1951.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010.

Kaslyn, Robert J. *"Communion with the Church" and the Code of Canon Law: An Analysis of the Foundation and Implication of the Canonical Obligation to Maintain Communion with the Catholic Church*. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1994.

Kobusch, Theo. "Die Lehre vom moralischen Sein in der Philosophie des F. Suarez." In *Die Entdeckung der Person: Metaphysik der Freiheit und modernes Menschenbild*, 55–66. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1993.

Komonchak, Joseph A. *Who Are the Church?: The Père Marquette Lecture in Theology 2008.* Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2008.

Kremer, Markus. "Tugend und Gesetz bei Francisco Suárez." In *Francisco Suárez "Der ist der Mann": Libro Homenaje al Prof. Salvador Castellote Cubells*, 253–73. Analecta Valentina 50. Valencia: Facultad de Teología San Vicente Ferrer, 2004.

Kronen, John. "Suárez's Influence on Protestant Scholasticism: The Cases of Hollaz and Turretin." In *A Companion to Francisco Suárez*. Edited by Victor M. Salas and Robert L. Fastiggi, 221–247. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Kuiper, Catherine S. "'Through the Features of Men's Faces': The Political Community in Francisco Suárez and John Locke." PhD diss., University of Notre Dame. 2016.

Lawlor, Francis X., S.J. "Occult Heresy and Membership in the Church." *Theological Studies* 10, no. 4 (December 1949): 541–54.

Lehner, Ulrich L. *The Catholic Enlightenment: The Forgotten History of a Global Movement.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Lohse, Bernhard. *Martin Luther's Theology: Its Historical and Systematic Development*. Translated and Edited by Roy A. Harrisville. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011.

Lubac, Henri de, S.J. *Catholicism: Christ and the Common Destiny of Man.* Translated by Lancelot C. Sheppard and Sr. Elizabeth Englund, O.C.D. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988.

Lubac, Henri de, S.J. *The Motherhood of the Church.* Translated by Sergia Englund. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1983.

Lubac, Henri de, S.J. *The Splendor of the Church*. Translated by Michael Mason. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1999.

Lubac, Henri de, S.J. "The Theological Foundation of the Missions." In *Theology in History*. Translated by Anne Englund Nash, 367–427. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1996.

Marschler, Thomas. *Die spekulative Trinitätslehre des Francisco Suárez S.J. in ihrem philosophisch-theologischen Kontext*. Münster: Aschendorff, 2007.

Marshall, Bruce D. "Lutherans, Bishops, and the Divided Church." *Ecclesiology* 1, no. 2 (2005): 25–42.

Marshall, Peter. *Heretics and Believers.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017.

Maryks, Robert A. *Saint Cicero and the Jesuits: The Influence of the Liberal Arts on the Adoption of Moral Probabilism*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013.

Mersch, Emile, S.J. *The Theology of the Mystical Body*. Translated by Cyril Vollert, S.J. St. Louis/London: Herder, 1951.

Mersch, Emile, S.J. *The Whole Christ: The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Mystical Body in Scripture and Tradition*. Translated by John R. Kelly, S.J. London: Dennis Dobson, 1938.

Midali, Mario, S.D.B. *Corpus Christi Mysticum apud Dominicum Báñez* eiusque fontes. Rome: Gregoriana, 1962.

Milton, Anthony. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Murphy, Paul V. "'God's Porters': The Jesuit Vocation According to Francisco Suárez." *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu* 70, no. 139 (2001): 2–28.

Nichols, Aiden, O.P. *Rome and the Eastern Churches: A Study in Schism*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2010.

Nicolau, Miguel S.J., "Francisco Suárez y el estado religioso." *Manresa* 21 (1949): 121–38.

Noreña, Carlos P. "Suárez and the Jesuits." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 65, no. 3 (1991): 267–86.

Oakley, Francis. *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church 1300–1870.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

O'Malley, John W. *The First Jesuits*. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1993.

O'Malley, John W. *Trent: What Happened at the Council.* Cambridge, MA/London: Belknap, 2013.

O'Malley, John W. "Was Ignatius Loyola a Church Reformer?: How to Look at Early Modern Catholicism." *Catholic Historical Review* 77 (1991): 177–93.

Pereira, José, and Robert Fastiggi. *The Mystical Theology of the Catholic Reformation.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2006.

Pidel, Aaron, S.J. "Suárez on Religion and Religious Pluralism." In *Francisco Suárez: Jesuits and the Complexities of Modernity*, edited by Robert Aleksander Markys and Juan Antonio Senent de Frutos, 128–53. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Pink, Thomas. "Suárez and Bellarmine on the Church as Coercive Lawgiver." In *Legge e Natura i dibattiti teologici e giuridici* fra XV e XVII secolo, edited by Riccardo Saccenti and Cinzia Sulas, 287–332. Arricia: Aracne editrice, 2016.

Plans, Juán Belda. *La Escuela de Salamanca y la renovación de la teologia en el siglo XVI.* Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 2000.

Plumer, Eric. "The Development of Ecclesiology: Early Church to the Reformation." In *The Gift of the Church: A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.*, edited by Peter C. Phan, 23–44. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

Posset, Franz. *Unser Martin: Martin Luther aus der Sicht katholischer Sympathisanten*. Münster: Aschendorff Verlag, 2015.

Rahilly, Alfred. "Suarez and Democracy." *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 7, no. 25 (March 1918): 1–21.

Rahner, Karl, S.J. *The Church and the Sacraments*. Translated by W. J. O'Hara. New York: Herder and Herder, 1963.

Rahner, Karl, S.J. *Theological Investigations*. Vol. 2. Translated by Karl-Heinz Kruger. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1963.

Rausch, Thomas P., S.J. *Towards a Truly Catholic Church: An Ecclesiology for the Third Millennium*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003.

Ravignan, P. de, S.J., *De l'existence et de l'institut des jésuites.* Paris: Poussielgue-Rusand, 1844.

Richard, Louis. "Une thèse fondamentale de l'oecuménisme: Le baptême, incorporation visible à l'Église." *Nouvelle revue théologique* 74 (1952): 485–92.

Riedl, Clare C. "Suárez and the Organization of Learning." In *Jesuit Thinkers of the Renaissance*, edited by Gerard Smith, S.J., 1–62. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 1939.

Rode, Christian. "Inner Experience in Suárez." *Documenti e Studi sulla tradizione filosofica medievale* 25 (2014): 421–60.

Root, Michael. "Bishops, Ministry, and the Unity of the Church in Ecumenical Dialogue: Deadlock, Breakthrough, or Both?" *CTSA Proceedings* 62 (2007): 19–35.

Rowland, Tracey. *Catholic Theology.* London/New York: Bloomsbury, 2017.

Sabra, George. *Thomas Aquinas' Vision of the Church*. Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald, 1987.

Salas, Victor, and Robert Fastiggi. "Francisco Suárez, the Man and His Work." In *A Companion to Francisco Suárez*, edited by Victor Salas and Robert Fastiggi, 1–28. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015.

Salaverri, Joaquín, S.J. "Autoridad de Suárez en el Concilio Vaticano." *Estudios eclesiásticos* 22 (1948): 205–26.

Salaverri, Joaquín, S.J. "La eclesiologia de Francisco Suarez." In *Actas del IV centenario del nacimiento de Francisco Suárez, 1548–1948*, II, 39–54. 2 Vols. Madrid: Dirección general de propaganda, 1949.

Schlesinger, Eugene R. *Missa est!: A Missional Liturgical Ecclesiology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2017.

Schöndorf, Harald, S.J. "Individuum und Indifferenz: Francisco Suárez, Philosoph im Geist des Ignatius." *Stimmen der Zeit* 209, no. 2 (February 1991): 109–22.

Schwarz, Daniel. "Francisco Suárez on Consent and Political Obligation." *Vivarium* 46 (2000): 59–81.

Schwarz, Reinhold. *Die eigenberechtigte Gewalt der Kirche*. Rome: Università Gregoriana Editrice, 1974.

Scorraille, Raoul de. *François Suarez, de la Compagnie de Jésus, d'après ses lettres, ses autres écrits inédits et un grand nombre de documents nouveaux*. 2 vols. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1912–1913.

Sgarbi, Marco, ed. *Francisco Suárez and His Heritage*. Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2010.

Skinner, Quentin. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. Vol. 2. *The Age of Reformation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Soujeole, Benoît-Dominique de la, O.P. *Introduction to the Mystery of the Church*. Translated by Michael J. Miller. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2014.

Spadaro, Antonio, and Carlos María Galli, eds. *For a Missionary Reform of the Church: The* Civiltà Cattolica *Seminar.* Translated by Demetrio S. Yocum. New York/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 2017.

Spanedda, Francesco. "L'ecclesiologia di Francesco Suárez." PhD diss., Pontificia Università Gregoriana. 1937.

Sullivan, Francis A., S.J. "The Evangelizing Mission of the Church." In *The Gift of the Church: A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.*, edited by Peter C. Phan, 231–48. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

Sullivan, Francis A., S.J. *Salvation outside the Church?: Tracing the History of the Catholic Response*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1992.

Thils, Gustave. *Les notes de l'Église dans l'apologétique catholique depuis la réforme*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1937.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. New York: Library of America, 2004.

Torrell, Jean-Pierre, OP. *A Priestly People: Baptismal Priesthood and Priestly Ministry*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 2013.

Torrell, Jean-Pierre, OP. *Saint Thomas Aquinas.* Vol. 2. *Spiritual Master.* Translated by Robert Royal. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2003.

Torrell, Jean-Pierre, OP. "Yves Congar et l'Ecclésiologie de Saint Thomas D'Aquin." *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 82 (1998): 201–42.

Treloar, John L. "Moral Virtue and the Demise of Prudence in the Thought of Francis Suárez." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 65 (1991): 387–405.

Turrini, Mauro. "Établissement critique du texte du 'De sacramentis in communi' de Thomas d'Aquin: 'Tertia Pars', qq. 60–65." *Studi Medievali* 3, no. 39 (December 1998): 911–52.

Vargas-Muchaca, Antonio. "Escritura, tradición e iglesia como reglas de fe según Francisco Suárez." PhD diss., University of Granada, 1967.

Vercruysse, P. Jos. E. "'Baptismus, qui etiam datur ab haereticis . . .': Genèse et signification du canon tridentin sur le baptême des hérétiques." *Gregorianum* 51.4 (1970): 649–77.

Weigel, George. *Evangelical Catholicism: Deep Reform in the 21st-Century Church*. New York: Basic Books, 2013.

Wicks, Jared, S.J., "Holy Spirit—Church—Sanctification: Insights from Luther's Instructions on the Faith." *Pro ecclesia* (January 1993): 150–172.

Wicks, Jared, S.J. "The Lutheran *forma ecclesiae* in the Colloquy at Augsburg, August 1530." In *Christian Authority: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, edited by G. R. Evans, 160–203. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Wood, Jacob W. "The Five-Hundredth Anniversary of the Reformation: A Catholic Perspective." In *Reformation Observances: 1517–2017*, edited by Philip D. W. Krey, 69–93. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2017.

Wood, Susan K. "The Church as Communion." In *The Gift of the Church: A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.*, edited by Peter C. Phan, 159–76. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

Wood, Susan K. "Continuity and Development in Roman Catholic Ecclesiology." *Ecclesiology* 7, no. 2 (May 2011): 147–72.

Wood, Susan K. *One Baptism: The Ecumenical Dimensions of the Doctrine of Baptism*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2009.

Wuellner, Bernard, S.J. *Summary of Scholastic Principles*. Chicago: Loyola, 1956.

Yamabe, Ken. "Eucharistie und Kirche bei F. Suárez." Ph.D. diss. University of Munich, 1974.

INDEX

For the benefit of digital users, indexed terms that span two pages (e.g., 52–53) may, on occasion, appear on only one of those pages.

Acquaviva, Claudio, 10n.35, 14–15
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 9–10, 24–25, 26–30, 37–39, 42–44, 46–47, 51–52, 60–61, 65–75, 83n.120, 94, 95–96, 128–29, 136–37, 151, 160–61
Aristotle, 40–41, 50n.138, 68–69, 169

Bañez, Domingo, 68–69, 78–79, 86n.135, 91–92n.162, 103–5, 120n.17, 123n.29, 136–37, 160n.48
baptism
  administered by heretics, 89–93, 180–84
  incorporation into the Church, 18–19, 50–51, 53–54, 59–60, 75–76, 95–100, 101
  sacramental formula, 83–84, 110, 129–31
  visible sign of unity, 103–5, 114, 169–70
  Bellarmine, St. Robert, 3–5, 11–12, 13n.49, 18–19, 24n.7, 27n.23, 40n.92, 54n.158, 59–61, 62–63, 71–72, 74–75n.79, 79–80, 82, 86n.135, 99–100, 104n.220, 136–37, 165–66, 179–80
Biel, Gabriel, 27–30, 63–64

Cajetan, Tomasso de Vio, 27–30, 47–48, 59–61, 79n.102, 91–92
Calvin, John, 71n.62, 86n.137
Cano, Melchior, 29n.33, 68–69, 78–79, 149–50
Castro, Alfonso de, 59–60, 86
charity, 11, 18, 37–38, 51–52, 65–67, 68–71, 73–75, 79–80, 83–84, 101, 108, 110, 117, 127–28, 133–35, 139, 145–46, 149, 157–58, 161–63, 164–65, 166–67, 168, 169–70, 171–73, 176, 185–86, 187
Chemnitz, Martin, 154n.29, 155n.30
Congar, Yves, 13–14n.51, 17n.63, 28–29nn.31–32, 63n.22, 75–76, 79n.103, 184–86
Coster, Francis, 68–69
Cyprian, St., 8n.27, 96n.184, 105–6

Dulles, Avery, 2–3, 5n.20, 89n.149, 93n.169, 118n.8, 147n.143, 184–86

Eck, Johann, 23–24

faith
  beginning of salvation, 51–52, 68, 70, 71, 73–74, 80, 139–40, 182–83
  catholic, 117, 119, 124–25, 127–29, 131–32, 171
  distinguished from *religio*, 44–45
  form of the Church, 11–12, 13, 23–24, 25–26, 30–31, 51–52, 53–54, 56–57, 59–67, 70, 71–74, 77–78, 79–80, 83–84, 89, 90–92, 125, 164–65, 167–68, 185
  implicit and explicit, 93–99, 180n.3
  interior compared with external profession, 100–5, 113–14
  rule of, 122
  uniformity of, 10–11, 19–20, 40–41, 51–52, 57, 128–29, 131, 133–34, 138–39, 145, 171–73, 187
fideles peccatores, 66–75, 79–80, 83–84

Gerhard, Johann, 4–5n.16, 68–69, 118n.10
Greek Church, 18–20, 59, 80–86, 89, 98–100, 110, 129–31, 175

Ignatius of Loyola, 7nn.23–24, 10n.34, 11, 54, 86, 88–89, 103–5, 150, 151–55, 156–57, 163n.67, 165–67, 169–70, 171–73, 175, 176
  Spiritual Exercises, 11, 54, 176–77

James I, 11–12, 14, 88, 90–93, 119, 124, 132–33, 136–37, 138, 187–88
Jerome, St., 19–20, 119, 137–38

Komonchak, Joseph A., 16–17, 184–86

law
  civil law, 18, 30–34, 37–38
  natural law, 39n.89, 42–45, 46–47, 50–51
  new law, 34–40, 50–51, 72–73, 95–98
  old law, 50–51, 72–73, 96n.184
living rule, 31–32, 38–39, 56–57, 128–29, 166–67, 171–73
Lubac, Henri de, 3–5, 34–35, 140, 183, 186–87
Lugo, Juan de, 87, 92–93, 181, 182–83
Luther, Martin, 139, 144–45

missions, 9, 93–97, 103n.212, 119–20, 121, 123–24, 135, 136–37, 140, 142, 145–46, 147, 150, 151, 156, 168, 173–78, 179, 186–88
Molina, Luis de, 15n.54, 82

Nadal, Jeronimo, 153–54, 156–57, 158

oath of allegiance, 11–12, 124

Pseudo-Dionysius, 54, 55–56

Quenstedt, Johann Andreas, 4–5n.16, 69n.53, 71n.62

religion
  definition of, 14–15, 18, 42–44, 100–1
  internal and external, 42–45, 100–14, 129–31, 165–70
  religion as a state of life, 14–15, 18, 20–21, 42–44, 45–56, 158–64
  religion as virtue, 14–15, 18, 42–45

schism, 18–19, 40–41, 59–61, 78n.97, 80–86, 88, 104n.222, 130, 133–34, 138–39, 167, 180–84
Society of Jesus
  Constitutions, 7–8, 9–10, 14–15, 88–89, 102–3, 152, 164n.75, 169–70, 171–73, 175
  educational methods, 6–11
  mission of the society, 9, 20–21, 171–78, 186–88
  Ratio studiorum, 9–10, 11
  superior, 20–21, 152–53, 165–67, 169–70, 171–73
  unity of the Society, 20–21, 164–70
Spanmüller, Jakob, 154
Stapleton, Thomas, 29n.33, 63–64
Suárez, Francisco, S.J.
  De fide theologica, 13–14, 25–27, 75–81, 84–86, 93–99, 100–2, 119, 120–24, 140–42
  De incarnatione, 10–11, 26–31, 94, 138–39
  De legibus, 9–10, 14, 24–25, 30–41, 46–48, 49, 51–52, 56–57, 93, 95–99, 145–46, 147
  De religione, 5–6, 9, 14–16, 17–18, 20–21, 23–25, 85–86, 105–9, 110, 119, 129–30, 133–35, 149–50, 155–78
  De sacramentis, 14–15, 73n.71, 81n.109, 83n.119, 85n.129, 89n.151, 89n.153, 109–10, 129–31
  Defensio fidei, 9, 14, 19–20, 30, 56–57, 76–77, 90–93, 99–101, 102–5, 111–14, 119, 124–33, 136–40, 142–47, 181–82, 183–84
  training and method, 6–12

Torquemada, Juan de, 25–26n.11, 27–30, 65n.34, 68–69
Trent, Council of, 3–5, 23–24, 37n.76, 56–57, 64–65, 66–67, 68–70, 71–72, 89, 117–18, 179–80
  Catechism of the Council of Trent, 25n.10, 27–30, 56–57, 117–18

Valencia, Gregory de, S.J., 29n.33, 38–39, 70n.59, 72–73, 120n.17, 122n.25, 136–37
Vásquez, Gabriel, 63n.19, 82
Vatican I, 36
Vatican II, 1–5, 77–78, 118, 180n.3
  Ad Gentes, 17, 186n.28
  Gaudium et Spes, 136–37n.89
  Lumen Gentium, 4–5n.16, 16n.61, 21n.69, 53n.155, 54, 55, 79n.101, 185n.22, 186n.27
  Unitatis Redintegratio, 18–19, 78–79, 81n.107, 86n.133, 87, 183–84
Vitoria, Francisco de, 25–26n.11, 29n.33, 93–94, 140–42